IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated: 23.08.2005

Coram:

The Honourable Mr.MARKANDEY KATJU, Chief Justice
and
The Honourable Mr.Justice A.KULASEKARAN

Writ Appeal No. 1513 of 2004
and
W.A.M.P.No.2812 of 2004
and
W.A.Nos. 2166 to 2170, 2509 to 2513, 2560 to 2564, 1368, 1373, 1374, 1399, 1403, 1509, 1610, 1698, 1708, 1729, 1734, 1851 to 1855, 1870 to 1874, 1727, 2634 to 2638 of 2004

and

W.P.Nos. 566, 567, 568, 2129, 2881, 2996 to 2998, 5980, 12816, 13344, 12101, 12102, 19873 to 19875, 24560, 24818, 24819, 24925, 24928, 25134 to 25136, 25169, 25236, 25357, 25364 to 25369, 25435, 25436, 25471, 25639, 25640, 25697, 25829 to 25833, 25891, 25892, 26024 to 26027, 26622, 26930, 8362, 26675 of 2003, 37273 to 37275, 38663, 42130, 42131, 42915, 42916, 43898, 43899, 44028, 44329, 45082, 45083, 42098 to 42100, 42605, 43727of 2002, 726 to 728, 849, 850 of 2003, 21155, 43224 to 43232 of 2002, 7819, 9396 to 9398, 10595, 1206 to 1210, 2722 to 2725, 5837, 6274, 9036, 9249, 9971, 14814, 16097, 725, 6614, 12496, 14166, 16456, 20080, 24262 to 24266, 24711 to 24717, 26250, 26424 to 26426, 26592, 26834, 26930, 27231, 27542, 27765, 27848, 27865 to 27867, 27872, 28101, 28257 to 28260, 28927, 29168, 29742, 29782, 30048, 30291, 30292, 2196, 2229, 25758 to 25762, 26310, 26311, 2435, 6344 to 6346, 6879, 18874, 18875, 18997, 20425 to 20428, 21066, 21067, 21126, 21127, 21727, 21728, 21757 to 21759, 21866, 22244 to 22246, 23568, 23569, 23795, 25273, 25825 to 25828, 21912, 25885 to 25887, 26091 to 26094, 9691, 26759 to 26762, 3168, 22807, 23869, 23872, 26194, 27477, 27478, 29462, 30477, 26414, 27760 to 27762, 27763, 27764, 28163 to 28166, 31859, 43663/2002 and 12006 of 2004

and

Connected W.A.M.Ps and W.P.M.Ps

M/S.MAGNA ELECTRO CASTINGS LTD.,
NO.62, BALASUNDARAM ROAD,
COIMBATORE - 641 018.
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR,
MR.N.KRISHNA SAMARAJ. … APPELLANT IN W.A. 1513/2004

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

TANFAC INDUSTRIES LTD.,
14 SIPCOT INDUSTRIAL
COMPLEX CUDDALORE -5
REP. BY ITS GENERAL MANAGER
(COMMERCIAL & COM.SEC)
G. BALASUBRAMANIAN ... APPELLANT IN W.A.NO. 2166 OF 2004

SRI. RATHINAGIRI SPINNINERS (P) LTD.,
S.F.NO.14/1 NH ROAD,
KAKKAVADI
VILLAGE, MANALMEDU POST KARUR 639 003
REP BY MANAGING DIRECTOR
P. SIVASANKAR ... APPELLANT IN W.A.NO. 2167 OF 2004

METTUR SPINNING MILLS LTD.,
METTUR DAM, METTUR SALEM REP.BY
ITS DIRECTOR P. BALAKRISHNAN ... APPELLANT IN W.A.NO. 2168 OF 2004

PANDIAN TEXTILES (P) LTD.,
KASIPALAYAM, KALVARPATTI VILLAGE
MEDASANDUR 624 711.
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR
M.K. PALANISAMY ... APPELLANT IN W.A.NO. 2169 OF 2004

ELKAYPEE SPINNERS P. LTD.,
581, KARUR ROAD,
VEDASANDUR 624 710
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR
P. GOVINDASAMY ... APPELLANT IN W.A.NO. 2170 OF 2004

KICL TEXTILES LTD.,
K. VADAMADURAI
METTUPALAYAM ROAD, CBE
17,REP BY ITS MANAGING
DIRECTOR S. KRISHNAKUMAR ... APPELLANT IN W.A.NO. 2509 OF 2004

SPIC PHARMACEUTICALS DVN
A DIVISION OF SOUTHERN PETRO
CHEMICALS IND. CORPORATION LTD.,
PLOT NO. C 14-16 SIPCOT
INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX, CUDDALORE -5
REP BY ITS GENERAL MANAGER
N. THIAYAGARAJAN ... APPELLANT IN W.A.NO. 2510 OF 2004

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

MEHALA CARONA TEXTILES (P) LTD.,
SAKTHI PRIVITHU ALUKKULI PO.,
GOBI TALUK, ERODE
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR
K.SWAMINATHAN ... APPELLANT IN W.A.NO. 2511 OF 2004

SJLT TEXTILES LTD. 285
TRICHY ROAD,
NAMAKKAL - 2
REP BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
V.JEGATHEESAN ... APPELLANT IN W.A.NO. 2512 OF 2004

PALMAR MILLS (P) LTD.,
UNIT-I,
LAKSHMIPURAM, SITHAYANKOTTAI -8.
DINDIGUL BY ITS CHAIRMAN ... APPELLANT IN W.A.NO. 2513 OF 2004

SRI VELAYUDHASWAMY SPINNING MILLS
LTD., NAGAMPATI - 624 710
VEDASANDUR TK.,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT
REP BY ITS GENERAL MANAGER
K. SELLAMUTHU ... APPELLANT IN W.A.NO. 2560 OF 2004

JEYAVARMA TEXTILES (P) LTD.,
GETHI CHEVIYUR GOBI TK,
ERODE DIST 638 458
REP BY MANAGING DIRECTOR
V.PALANISAMY ... APPELLANT IN W.A.NO. 2561 OF 2004

SENTHILNATHAN SPINNING MILLS (P)
LTD., 165 SALEM MAIN ROAD,
ADHIYAMANKOTAI - 636 807
DHARMAPURID DISTRICT
REP BY DIRRECTOR
C.PALANIVEL ... APPELLANT IN W.A.NO. 2562 OF 2004

S.S.D. SPINNING MILLS LTD.,
MUTHU LAPURAM VILATHIKULAM TK
TUTCORIN DISTRICT
REP.BY ITS MANAGER
C.KATHIRESAN ... APPELLANT IN W.A.NO. 2563 OF 2004

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

SVASYNTEX (P) LTD.,
THALAAIYTHU VILLAGE NARICKALPATY POST
PALANI TK
DINDIGUAL DISTRICT
REP.BY ITS FACTORY MANAGER
G.R. DURAI ... APPELLANT IN W.A.NO. 2564 OF 2004

THAMBBI MODERN SPINNING MILLS LTD. UNIT-II REP.BY ITS M.D. MR.R.JAGADESAN
OOP. TNEB SUB STATION, KAMARAJA NAGAR,
COLONY PO., SALEM - 636 014. ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1368 OF 2004

M/S.AMIRTHALAKSHMI SPINNING MILLS P LTD.
107 B KUNNATHUR ROAD
SEENAPURAM
PERUNDURAI REP.BY ITS DIRECTOR MR.B.D. BALAKRISHNAN ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1373 OF 2004

THAMBBI MODERN SPINNING MILLS LTD. UNIT-III
REP.BY ITS M.D MR.R.JAGADESAN
SALEM 636 014 ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1374 OF 2004

M/S.MARIYAMMAL SPINNERS (P) LTD
REP.BY ITS M.D. MR.T. DHANASEKARAN
RAMACHANDRAPURAM
VIA SUNDARA PANDIAN,
SRIVILLIPUTHUR TK.,
VIRUDHUNAGAR DIST ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1399 OF 2004

M/S.UMAYAL SPINNERS PVT.LTD.
REP BY ITS MD.
MR.A.THAVASI ANANDHAM S.
RAMACHANDRAPURAM VIA
SUNDARAPANDIAM
SRIVILLIPUTHUR TK.,
VIRUDHUNAGAR- DISTRICT. ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1403 OF 2004

M/S.SREE RANGANATHAR MILLS
REP.BY ITS M.D. PR. RATHNAM
22/1 VENKITTAPURAM ROAD
CHINNIYAMPALAYAM
CBE-62 ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1509 OF 2004

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

SIVAKASI ELECTRO CHEMICALS LTD ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1610 OF 2004
REP.BY ITS CHAIRMAN AND
M.D. C.A. JAIRJ 116-A
MUNDAGA NADAR ST
VIRUDHUNAGAR

M/S.N.G.A.STEELS PVT LTD. ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1698 OF 2004
6/1. ANJANEYAR KOVIL STREET
AGARAHARAM NEAR A.V. LODGE,
TIRUCHENGODE - 637 211
NAMAKKAL DISTRICT,
REP.BY ITS M.D. N.ANGALAGAN

M/S.KRISHNA ALLOYS AKKAMMAPET ...APPELLANT IN WA NO.1708 OF 2004
PO. SANKARI TK SALEM DIST
REP BY N. ANBALAGAN PARTNER

M/S.PAVAI ALLOYS AND STEELS PVT .. APPELLANT IN WA NO.1729 OF 2004
LTD. KANDAMPALAYAM
PARAMATHI VELELORE TK,
REP.BY ITS M.D., V.KUPPUSAMY

M/S.VIGNESWARA STEELS PVT LTD ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1734 OF 2004
S.F.110/1-A-1 MAVELIPALAYAM
PRIVU ROAD AKKEMPETTAI POST,
SANKARI,
REP.BY ITS M.D.C. MARAPAN

INDRA COTTON MILLS LIMITED ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1851 OF 2004
JAGAMPET GARDENS CHROMEPET
CHENNAI - 44
REP.BY ITS M.D.
AL.CT.ALAGAPPA CHETTIAR

M/S.RUBY CHLORATES (P) LTD. ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1852 OF 2004
11-B SASTRY ROAD TENNUR
TRICHY REP.BY
ITS M.D. D.BASKARAN

MOTHI SPINNERS LTD. ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1853 OF 2004
ATHIKATTOOR PRIVU
ARANGUR(PO) THIRUCHENCODE TK
NAMAKKAL DIST REP.BY ITS M.D.
M.CHANDRASEKAR

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

SRI SARAVANAN SPINNING MILLS LTD. PITHALAIPATTY DINDIGUL REP.BY ITS CHIEF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR JAIKUMAR KRISHNASAMY ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1854 OF 2004

SRI MAPPILLLLAI VINAYAGAR ROLLER FLOUR MILLLS 163 NETHAJI ROAD MADURAI REP.BY ITS PARTNER K.VETRIVEL KANNAN ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1855 OF 2004

M/S.ARUN SMELTERS LTD 54 1ST LANE PANTHEON ROAD EGMORE CHENNAI-8 REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR UMESH MADAN ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1870 OF 2004

M/S.THE SRI GANAPATHY MILLS CO. LTD B UNIT BYPASS RD VIRUDHUNAGAR-1 REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR V. JAYARAMAN ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1871 OF 2004

M/S.SRI KARTHIKEYA SPINNING AND WEAVING MILLS LTD P.B. NO.3301 UPPILLIPALAYAM COIMBATORE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE COIMBATORE-15 ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1872 OF 2004

ARUN VYAPAR UDYOG LIMITED 54 1ST LANE PANTHEON ROAD EGMORE CHENNAI-8 REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR UMESH MADAN ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1873 OF 2004

M/S.ANNAMALAIAR MILLS LTD BEGAMPUR POST DINDIGUL-2 REP.BY ITS GENERAL MANAGER S.KRISHNAMURTHI ...APPELLANT IN WA NO.1874 OF 2004

M/S.SRI VINAYAKA ALLOYAS PVT. LTD 28/2-A-1 SALEM MAIN ROAD AKKEMPETTAI POST SANKARI 637 301 T.SUDANTHARA RAJAN ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.1727 OF 2004

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

DEVENTHIRA SPINNERS PRIVATE LTD. PADAVEEDU VILLAGE SANNIYASIPATTI POST SANKARI (W), NAMAKKAL DISTRICT REP.BY ITS DIR.R.P.PONGIANNAN ...APPELLANT IN WA NO.2634 OF 2004

STERLING SPINNERS LIMITED PA.PUDUPATTI VEDASANDUR TALUK DINDIGUL REP.BY ITS MANAGER (ACCTS & ADMNS)S. CHANDRASEKARAN ...APPELLANT IN WA NO.2635 OF 2004

K.T.V.OIL MLLS C-85 II MAIN ROAD SIPCOT INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX TUTICORIN REP.BY ITS PARTNER K.T.V.KANNAN ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.2636 OF 2004

PRASANNA SPINNING MILLS LAKSHMANAMPATTHY VEDASANTHUR DINDIGUL DIST. REP.BY ITS GENERAL MANAGER K.SELLAMUTHU ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.2637 OF 2004

ROGINI MILLS INDIAMPALAYAM - 638 454 ARASUR POST SATHYAMANGALAM TALUK ERODE DIST. REP.BY ITS PARTNER R.SEMALAIPPAN ... APPELLANT IN WA NO.2638 OF 2004

M/S.SRI JAGANANTHA TEXTILES LTD. REP BY ITS DIRECTOR N.NARASIMHALU. 1493, SATHYAMANGALAM ROAD, GANAPATHI POST, COIMBATORE - 641 006. ...PETITIONER IN WP NO.566 OF 2003

M/S.SRI RAMAKRISHNA MILLS COIMBATORE) LTD. REP BY ITS VICE PRESIDENT PLANNING & FINANCE N.NARASIMHALU 1493, SATHYAMANGALAM ROAD, GANAPATHI POST, COIMBATORE - 641 006 ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.567 OF 2003

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

M/S. SWATHI PROCESSORS LTD., ...PETITIONER IN WP NO.568 OF 2003
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR
N. NARASIMBALU
1493, SATHYAMANGALAM ROAD,
GANAPATHI POST,
COIMBATORE - 641 006

THIRUPUR SURIYA TEXTILES (P) ...PETITIONER IN WP NO.2129 OF 2003
LTD, KALVARPATTI VILLAGE
VEDRSANDUR TK.,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT
REP BY ITS MD MR.K.KUPPUSAMY

D.P.N.SPINNERS (P) LTD ... PETITIONER in WP No.2881 of 2003
ERIODU ROAD,
SRIRAMAPURAM, VEDASANDUR TK.,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT 624 702
REP BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
MR.DEVARAJ B.E

KARIKALI AMMAN SPINNING MILLS ... PETITIONER in WP No.2996 of 2003
(P) LTD. ELUNAMATHUR TO
POONDURAI ROAD,ELUMATHUR POST, 638 104
ERODE DISTRICT
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR
MR.M.KARTHIKEYAN

PARANI SPINNING MILLS (P) LTD ... PETITIONER in WP No.2997 of 2003
NH-7,KARUR ROAD,
VEDASANDUR- 624 710,
DINDIGAL DISTRICT
REP BY ITS M.D.
MR.M.KRISHNASAMY

GUHAN TEXTILE MILLS (P) LTD ... PETITIONER in WP No.2998 of 2003
VIRUTHALAIPATHY (PO)
VEDASANDUR - 624 711
REP BY ITS M.D.
MR.M. KARUPPUSAMY

DARSHEN SINGH ... PETITIONER in WP No.5980 of 2003
S/O. GURUDAYAL SINGH,
209/2, BANAGARAM ROAD,
CHENNAI - 58

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

PLASWEDE PRIVATE LIMITED ... PETITIONER in WP No.12816 of 2003
9,TENKASI ROAD,
TIRUNELVELI OF SENKOTTAI
REP.BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR S.
RAMAN.

LAKSHMI GANESH TEXTILES CBE ... PETITIONER in WP No.13344 of 2003
P) LTD. REP BY ITS DIRECTOR
A.MARIAN 259
THENNAMPALAYAM ARASUR & POST
COIMBATORE. 641 407

K.S.R. TEXTILE MILLS PVT. LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.12101 of 2003
TOKKAVADI PO,
TIRUCHENGODE - 637 209
NAMAKKAL DISTRICT
REP. BY ITS JOINT MANAGING
DIRECTOR. MR.
K.R.SENGOTTUVEL

SURANA TEXTILE MILLS LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.12102 of 2003
536 DON BOSCO PURAM, VELLAKINAR POST,
COIMBATORE - 641 029
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR.
MR.S. N.SUBRAMANIAM

FENNER (INDIA) LIMITED ... PETITIONER in WP No.19873 of 2003
(UNIT-I) MANAVASI, KULITHALAI TK,
KARUR DT. 636108 REP.BY ITS VICE PRESIDENT
R.NATARAJAN.

FENNER (INDIA) LIMITED ... PETITIONER in WP No.19874 of 2003
(TEXTILE DIVISION) PATTUKONAMPATTI,
PAPPIREDDIPATTI TK, DHARMAPURI DT. 636 905
REP.BY ITS VICE PRESIDENT
R.NATARAJAN.

FENNER (INDIA) LIMITED ... PETITIONER in WP No.19875 of 2003
3,MADURAI-MELAKKAL RD,KOCHADAI MADURAI -16,
REP.BY ITS COMPANY SECY.
S.RAJAGURU

TVL.TABLETS INDIA LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.24560 of 2003
REP.BY T.G.SRINIVASAN
DY.GENL.MANAGER, 179 TH ROAD,CH-19.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

M/S.THIRUMALA ALLOYS CASTINGS ... PETITIONER in WP No.24818 of 2003
P.LTD. REP BY ITS M.D.SATISH AGARWAL
NO.36-B SIPCOT INDUS COMPLEX, HOSUR,
DHARMAPURI DT.

M/S.CHAMUNDI STEEL CASTING ... PETITIONER in WP No.24819 of 2003
INDIA) LTD. REP BY ITS M.D. MAHINDRA KUMAR
GUPTA, NO.140/1-4 KALUKONDAPALLY VILLAGE,
BELAGONDAPALLY P.O.,DHARMAPURI DISTRICT.

SRI MADURAMBIGAI SPINNING ... PETITIONER in WP No.24925 of 2003
MILLS (P) LTD.SF NO.477/2A
SEMMANDAM PALAYAM,VELLAKOVIL 638111 ERODE DIST.
REP BY ITS MANAGING
DIRECTOR S.JAGANATHAN

MAHARAJA SATHYAM INDUSTRIES (P) LTD.,
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR MR. K.PARAMASIVAM
119, BHAVANI ROAD, ERODE 638004 ..PETITIONER IN WP NO.24928/2003

ELGI EQIPMENTS LTD-UNIT II
IND. ESTATE SIDCO, POLLACHI MAIN ROAD,
COIMBATORE 23 .. PETITIONER in WP No.25134 of 2003
MANAGING DIRECTOR DR.JAYARAM
VARADARAJ

ELGI EQIPMENTS LTD ... PETITIONER in WP No.25135 of 2003
ELGI INDUS COMPLEX,SINGANALLUR
COIMBATORE 5, REP. BY ITS
MANAGING DIRECTOR DR.JAYARAM VARADARAJ

ELGI EQIPMENTS LTD-UNIT I ... PETITIONER in WP No.25136 of 2003
IND. ESTAGTE SIDCO, POLLACHI MAIN ROAD,
COIMBATORE -23 REP. BY ITS
MANAGING DIRECTOR DR.JAYARAM VARADARAJ

M/S AKSHAYA TEXTILES LIMITED ... PETITIONER in WP No.25169 of 2003
REP BY JOINT MANAGING DIRECTOR
PB NO.008 GANAPATHI POST,COIMBATORE 641 006

M/S.GLOBAL PHARMATECH (P) LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.25236 of 2003
REP BY M.D.MEGANATHAN,
32,SIPCOT INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX,
PHASE-I, HOSUR 635 126

M/S.SURANA METALS & STEEL INDIA ... PETITIONER in WP No.25357 of 2003
LTD. F67,68,69 SIPCOT COMPLEX
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR (OPERATIONS)

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

M.RAMASUBRAMANIAN
GUMMIDIPOONDI.

CENTWIN TEXTILE MILLS (P) LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.25364 of 2003
KARUR RD., VEDASANDUR 624 710,DINDIGUL
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR MR.K.G. SENTHILKUMAR.

ELKAYPEE SPINERS (P) LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.25365 of 2003
581, KARUR RD., VADASANDUR 624 710,DINDIGUL
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR MR.K.G. SENTHILKUMAR.

THURAN SPINNING MILLS (P) LTD ... PETITIONER in WP No.25366 of 2003
577, KARUR RD, VEDASANDUR 624710, DINDIGUL
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR MR.K.G.SENTHILKUMAR.

BANNARI AMMAN SPINNING MILLS ... PETITIONER in WP No.25367 of 2003
LTD.MOREPATTI,VADAMADURAI,
VEDASANDUR 624 802, DINDIGUL
REP BY ITS ASSISTANT G.M.MR.P.BASKAR

THIRUPUR SURIYA TEXTILES (P) ... PETITIONER in WP No.25368 of 2003
LTD.KALWARPATTI VILLAGE,
VEDASANDUR TK, DINDIGUL 624 711
REP BY ITS M.D. MR.K.KUPPUSAMY.

SHIVA TEXYARN ... PETITIONER in WP No.25369 of 2003
VELVARKOTTAI,VEDASANDUR 624803,DINDIGUL
REP BY ITS ASSISTANT G.M.MR.K. PRABHAKARAN

STERLING SPINNERS LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.25435 of 2003
PAPUDUPATTI, VEDASANDUR TK,DINDIGUL 624 005
REP BY ITS M.D. S.KUMAR.

SRI SARAVANA SPINNING MILLS (P) ... PETITIONER in WP No.25436 of 2003
LTD. UNIT-II RANGANATHAPURAM,VEDASANDUR-624711
REP BY ITS CHIEF EXECUTIVE MR.JAIKUMAR KRISHNASAMY.

M/S.GEE GEE STEELS AND ALLOYS ... PETITIONER in WP No.25471 of 2003
PT.LTD REP BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR K.
VENNIMALAI 127/2B,SADAYANKUPPAM RD.,
VAIKKADU VILLAGE, MANALI, CHENNAI 103.

SRI SARAVANA SPINNING MILLS (P) ... PETITIONER in WP No.25639 of 2003
LTD. UNIT-I PITHALAIPATTI, DINDIGAL
REP BY ITS EXECUTIVE MR.JAIKUMAR KRISHNASAMY.

SRI DORAIRAJ SPINTEX ... PETITIONER in WP No.25640 of 2003
A UNIT OF BALAJI SPINNERS LTD.,
KARAGIKKOTTAM , VILLAGE, PAPPAMPATTI,PALANI 624621,

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

DINDIGUL DISTRICT REP BY ITS FACTORY MANAGER
MR.V.NARAYANAN

PETAL SHAMROCK P.LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.25697 of 2003
BUILDING NO.2 SF NO.335/341 NEW COLONY
15, VELAMPALAYAM,ANUPARPALAYAM POST,
TIRUPPUR 641 652, COIMBATORE
REP.BY ITS MANAGER C.ARJUN.

MEERA TEXTILES (P) LIMITED ... PETITIONER in WP No.25829 of 2003
SENNAUKOTTAI, VEDASENDUR 624 710
DINDIGUL DISTRICT
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR A.P.AMMASIKUTTY

THAKADOOR SPINNING MILLS (P) ... PETITIONER in WP No.25830 of 2003
LTD.65/102 NALLANANALLI VILLAGE
KRISHNAGIRI MAIN ROAD -636 701
REP BY ITS M.D. MR.N.NATARJAN

KUTTI SPINNERS (P) LIMITED ... PETITIONER in WP No.25831 of 2003
115/1A, UNJANAI VILLAGE NAMAKKAL DT.
KUMARAMANGALAM POST 637211
REP BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR T.GNANASEKAR

SIR VAKIRA KAALI AMMAN SPG ... PETITIONER in WP No.25832 of 2003
MILLS LIMITED SILUKKUVARPATTI 624 215,
NILAKOTTAI,DINDIGUL DT.
REP BY ITS EXECUTIVE
DIRECTOR R.JAGADEESWARAN

VAIGAI FINETEX LIMITED ... PETITIONER in WP No.25833 of 2003
KODANGAI NAICKANPATTI,SALAIPUDUR RD.,
NILAKOTTAI 624 208, DINDIGUL DT.
REP BY ITS FACTORY MANAGER P.RAVI

M/S KANDAGIRI SPINNING MILLS ... PETITIONER in WP No.25891 of 2003
LIMITED REP BY THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
PB NO.3 UTHAYAPATTI, SALEM 636141

WEB COPY

M/S KANDAGIRI SPINNING MILLS ... PETITIONER in WP No.25892 of 2003
LIMITED UNIT II REP BY THE
MANAGING DIRECTOR
STATION CHAVADI POST, SALEM -636 004

PANDIAN TEXTILE MILLS P.LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.26024 of 2003
KASIPALAYAM, VEDASANDUR -624 711
DINDIGUL DISTRICT
REP.BY ITS DIRECTOR AP.AMMASAI KUTTY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

KHADER SPINNERS LTD.MM KOVILUR, ... PETITIONER in WP No.26025 of 2003
DINDIGUL 624009
REP.BY ITS MANAGER MR.K.ABDUL RAHMAN

RASI TECHNITEX (P)LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.26026 of 2003
CUDDALORE MAIN ROAD SARVAI
MANIVILANTHAN SOUTH ATTUR 626121, SALEM REP.BY
ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR S.SENTHILNATHAN

SENTHILNATHAN SPINNING MILLS ... PETITIONER in WP No.26027 of 2003
(P)LTD.165, SALEM MAIN ROAD,
ATHIYAMANKOTTAI 636 807
DHARMAPURI DISTRICT
REP.BY ITS DIRECTOR C.PALANIVEL.

VEERAPPAN STEELS (P)LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.26622 of 2003
SF 73/2 MADAVANERI POST,
VEMBADITHALAM (VIA) SALEM 637504
REP.BY C.KRISHNAMOORTHY DIRECTOR

M/S SAVORIT LIMITED - HT SC ... PETITIONER in WP No.26930 of 2003
NO.1087 UNITED INDIA ROLLER FLOUR MILLS
NO.6 (OLD NO.377/1)S.N. STREET, TOLGATE,
CHENNAI 81. REP BY ITS DIRECTOR P.MURUGESAN

SREE KATHIKEYA INDUSTRIES ... PETITIONER in WP No.8362 of 2003
87 & 32 sidco IND. ESTATE, RANIPET 632 403
REPD BY ITS MG.PARTNER P.ANBAZHAGAN

M/S.ARASAN AIR PRODUCTS ... PETITIONER in WP No.26675 of 2003
PVT.LTD. C60 SIPCOT INDUSTRIAL ESTATE,
TUTICORIN REP.BY ITS DIRECTOR S.ANAND GANESH

SREE VANNI VINAYAGA TEXTILE ... PETITIONER in WP No.37273 of 2002
MILLS (P) LTD. REP.BY ITS MANAGING
DIRECTOR A. SELVARAJ, AYANERI 628 502,
KOVILPATTI

PEARL CHLORATES PVT. LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.37274 of 2002
REP.BY ITS CHAIRMAN AND DIRECTOR M.
RAJAMANICKAM, 20 SATTUR ROAD, KOVILPATTI-628501,
TUTICORIN DISTRICT.

S.S.D. OIL MILLS CO. LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.37275 of 2002
132, VILLAGE ROAD, IYYAPPANTHANGAL
CHENAI 56 REP.BY ITS DIRECTOR
MR. D. RAMAMOORTHY

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

TVL.AMALI MILLS (P) LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.38663 of 2002
THIRU.R.FRANCIS M.D. REP.BY
4/34 K.VENKATESWARAN ROAD,
KALUMALAI, TUTICORIN.

M/S.THE MEENAKSHI VILASA CO.(P) ... PETITIONER in WP No.42130 of 2002
LTD REP BY ITS DIRECTOR MR.V.RAJU NAIDU
KOTTAMANGALAM, UDUMALPET TK.

M/S.DEVI KARUNBAMBIKAI TEXTILE ... PETITIONER in WP No.42131 of 2002
MILLS LTD 246, OOTHUPALAYAM RD,
ARASUR , COIMBATORE 641 407 REP BY ITS
MANAGING DIRECTOR MR.D.CHANDRASEKARAN

ARUNA MACHINE TOOLS ... PETITIONER in WP No.42915 of 2002
A & B UNIT 3/1 ULAGANERI VILLAGE,
UTHANGKUDI, MADURAI 620 107 REP BY ITS
PARTNER MR.S.V.PETHA PERUMAL

SRI KADERI AMBAL MILLS LTD ... PETITIONER in WP No.42916 of 2002
A & B UNIT HT.SC.46 & 75
SHANMUGANATHAPURAM P.O.SIVAGANGAI DISTRICT
REP BY ITS EXE.DIRECTOR
PARTNER MR.S.V.PETHA PERUMAL

VENI LAKSHMI MILLS P.LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.43898 of 2002
REP BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR P.NATARAJAN.
KATHIRANAICKENPALAYAM, K.VADAMADURAI POST
COIMBATORE 641 017

VAIRAVA TEXTILES LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.43899 of 2002
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR RM.GOVINDAN
SENJERY ROAD, PETHAPPAMPATTI
UDUMALPET.

TVL.SELLIAMMAN SPINNING MILLS ... PETITIONER in WP No.44028 of 2002
P.LTD. SELLIAMMAN NAGAR METTUIPATTY
SESHANCHAVADI VIA. SALEM. 636 111
REP. BY MANAGING DIRECTOR

SRI SOWDESWARI MILLS P.LTD ... PETITIONER in WP No.44329 of 2002
REP BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR ARTHANARI
CHETTIAR 201A, THARAMANGALAM MAIN ROAD
KOTTAMPATTI, JALAGANDAPURAM

NACHIMAR SPINNING MILLS P.LTD .. PETITIONER in WP No.45082 of 2002
REP BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR G.
PANKAJAM S.F.NO.100 B1,B2 UNJAKELANPATTI POLLACHI

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

MR.R.GOVIINDARAJ ... PETITIONER in WP No.45083 of 2002
MANAGING PARTNER
MODERN SPINNY MILLS SF 151 SAMATHUR
POLLACHI 642 123

M/S.JAYSHREE TEXTILES P.LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.42098 of 2002
PANIKAMPATTY KURUMBAPALAYAM POST POLLACHI
REP.BY DIRECTOR MR.K.RAMESHKUMAR.

M/S.AMSAM SPINNING MILLS P.LTD ... PETITIONER in WP No.42099 of 2002
ERANGATTUPALAYAM P.PULIAMPATTI POST
ERODE 638 451 REP. BY ITS
MD. MR.P.MURUGESAN

M/S.PVS.TEXTILES P.LTD. ... PETITIONER in WP No.42100 of 2002
PONGALUR POST AVANASHI TK.
COIMBATORE DT.
REP.BY DIRECTOR S.RAGHURAMAN
VIA P.PULIAMPATTI 638 459

M/S.SAVITHA SPINNING MILLS ... PETITIONER in WP No.42605 of 2002
P.LTD.REP BY ITS MD MR.G.S. VELAYUTHAM
S NO.1264/1 1265 CHOLAPURAM
RAJAPALAYAM TALUK 626 139

SRI NACHAMMAI COTTON MILLS LTD.
A AND B UNIT CHETTINAD
SIVAGANGA 630 902
REP. BY MD. MR.P.PALANIAPPAN ..PETITIONER IN WP.43727/2002

TULSYAN NEC LTD.
REP. BY ITS AUTHORISED SIGNATORY
S.SANKAR,
147, GREAMS ROAD, V FLOOR,
CHENNAI-600 006. ..PETITIONER IN WP.726/2003

ARUN VYAPAR UDYOG LTD.,
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR
UMESH MADAN,
54, 1ST LANE, PANTHEON ROAD
EGMORE, CHENNAI-8. ..PETITIONER IN WP.727/2003

ARUN SMELTERS LTD.,
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR
UMESH MADAN,
54, 1ST LANE, PANTHEON ROAD
EGMORE, CHENNAI-8. ..PETITIONER IN WP.728/2003

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

NAMAKKAL COTTON MILLS (P) LTD.,
REP. BY IT DIRECTOR
MR.K.CHANDRASEKAR
5-1 D SALEM TRICHY ROAD
MUTHUKALIPATTY (PO)
RASIPURAM-637 401
NAMAKKAL DISTRICT. ..PETITIONER IN WP.849/2003

PAVATHAL SPINNING MILLS (P) LTD.
REP. BY IT DIRECTOR
MR.K.V.NATESAN,
KOLUMAM ROAD, NEIKKARAPATTI
DINDIGUL DISTRICT-624 615 ..PETITIONER IN WP.850/2003

ROYAL CHLORATES PRIVATE LTD.,
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
A.XAVIER JAYAPAUL,
S.F.NO.12/3-A, PASUVANTHANAI
VILLAGE,
OTTAPEDARAM, TUTICORIN DISTRICT .. PETITIONER IN WP.21155/2002

KALAPATTI SPINNING MILLS (P) LTD.
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
K.NARAYANASAMY,
S.F.NO.198, KALAPATTI MAIN ROAD
KALAPATTI, COIMBATORE-641 035. .. PETITIONER IN WP.43224/2002

HINDUSTAN SPINNERS B UNIT
REP. BY PARTNER D.SELVARAJAN
862/1, BETTATHAPURAMPUDUR
KARAMADAI, COIMBATORE-641 104. ..PETITIONER IN WP.43225/2002

HINDUSTAN SPINNERS
REP. BY ITS PARTNER
D.SELVARAJAN,
223, METTUPALAYAM ROAD
NARASIMANAICKENPALAYAM
COIMBATORE-641 031. ..PETITIONER IN WP.43226/2002

HINDUSTAN TEXTILES
REP. BY ITS PARTNER
S.SHANTHI
Y372 METTUPALAYAM ROAD,
K.VADAMADURAI POST
COIMBATORE-641 017. ..PETITIONER IN WP.43227/2002

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

FENNER (INDIA) LTD. (UNIT-II)
REP. BY ITS VICE PRESIDENT
R.NATARAJAN
PATTUKONAMPATTY,
PAPPIREDDYPATTY TALUK
DHARMAPURI DISTRICT-636 905 ..PETITIONER IN WP.43228/2002

SRI THEIVASIGAMANI SPINNERS
REP. BY ITS PARTNER
KRISHNAKUMAR CHATRABHUJ
MOTHEPALAYAM,
JADAIYAMPALAYAM POST
METTUPALAYAM TALUK
COIMBATORE DISTRICT. ..PETITIONER IN WP.43229/2002

FENNER (INDIA) LTD. (UNIT-I)
REP. BY ITS VICE PRESIDENT
R.NATARAJAN
MANAVARI, KULITHALAI TALUK,
KARUR DISTRICT-636 905 ..PETITIONER IN WP.43230/2002

HINDUSTAN COTTON SPINNING MILLS
REP. BY PARTNER D.SOUNDARARAJAN
S.F.NO.341, METTUPALAYAM ROAD
NARASIMANAICKENPALAYAM,
COIMBATORE. ..PETITIONER IN WP.43231/2002

ENNAR SPINNING MILLS (P) LTD.,
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
K.NARAYANASAMY
S.F.No.807, KADATHUR PIRUVU
GANESAPURAM POST,
COIMBATORE 641 107 ..PETITIONER IN WP.43232/2002

SRI GNANAVEL SPINNING MILLS P.LTD.
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
S.GNANAPANDITHAN
365-1B, KOVAI MAIN ROAD
P.PULIANPATTI, SATHY TALUK ..PETITIONER IN WP.7819/2003

SHANSUN CHEM AND DRUGS LTD.
HTSC NO.94 A1/B SIPCOT COMPLEX
KULIKADU VILLAGE,
CUDDALORE-607 005.
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
V.PARTHASARATHY. ..PETITIONER IN WP.9396/2003

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

SHANSUN CHEM AND DRUGS LTD.
HTSC NO.94 A1/B SIPCOT COMPLEX
KULIKADU VILLAGE,
CUDDALORE-607 005.
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
V.PARTHASARATHY. ..PETITIONER IN WP.9397/2003

RAJAGURU SPINNING MILLS (P) LTD.,
249, SANKAGIRI MAIN ROAD
VEDIGARASANPALAYAM,
PALLIPALAYAM-638 008
ERODE DISTRICT BY ITS
MANAGING DIRECTOR S.BALU ..PETITIONER IN WP.9398/2003

CEE TEE NACHI TEXTILE (P) LTD.,
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR
AR.MURUGAPPAN
POONIMANGADU VILLAGE-631 212
THIRUTHANI TALUK,
TIRUVALLUR DISTRICT. ..PETITIONER IN WP.10595/2003

VINAYAGA ALLOYS LTD.,
B-48E, SIPCOT INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX,
GUMMIDIPOONDI-601 201,
CHENNAI, REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR
ASHOK KUMAR JAIN ..PETITIONER IN WP.1206/2003

M/S.SAVORIT LTD. HTSC.1234
(UNITED INDIA ROLLER FLOUR MILL)
NO.2 (OLD NO.377/3) S.N.STREET
TOLLGATE, CHENNAI-81,
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR
P.MURUGESAN. ..PETITIONER IN WP.1207/2003

M/S.SAVORIT LTD. HTSC.24
(UNITED INDIA FOODS)
1 KARUR ROAD, DINDIGUL
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR
P.MURUGESAN ..PETITIONER IN WP.1208/2003

M/S. SAVORIT LTD., HTSC.1234
(UNITED INDIA ROLLER FLOUR MILL)
NO.2 (OLD NO.377/3)S.N.STREET
TOLLGATE, CHENNAI-81
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR
P.MURUGESAN ..PETITIONER IN WP.1209/2003

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

M/S.SAVORIT LTD., HTSC.41
(UNITED INDIA FOODS)
131, TRICHY ROAD,
DINDIGUL-624 001.
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR
P.MURUGESAN. ..PETITIONER IN WP.1210/2003

THIAGARAJAR MILLS LTD.
UNIT I KAPPALUR MADURAI-625 008
REP. BY ITS GENERAL MANAGER
P.K.VENUGOPAL ..PETITIONER IN WP.2722/2003

COLOUR YARN LTD.,
ALAMPATTY VILLAGE,
THIRUMANGALAM
MADURAI-625 008
REP. BY ITS AUTHORISED OFFICER
P.K.VENUGOPAL ..PETITIONER IN WP.2723/2003

THIAGARAJAR MILLS LTD.,
NO.14, 15 AND 16, INDUSTRIAL
ESTATE, SULAKARAI,
VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT.
REP. BY ITS AUTHORISED OFFICER
P.K.VENUGOPAL ..PETITIONER IN WP.2724/2003

VIRUDHUNAGAR TEXTILE MILLS LTD.,
SULAKARAI, VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT
REP. BY ITS AUTHORISED OFFICER
P.K.VENUGOPAL. ..PETITIONER IN WP.2725/2003

M/S.SOUTHERN ALLOYS FOUNDRIES
(P) LTD.,
149, G.N.T. ROAD,
PONNIAMMANMENDU POST
CHENNAI-600 110 ..PETITIONER IN WP.5837/2003

M/S. AVT NATURAL PRODUCTS LTD.,
234/1, PUPUVADVALLI
SATHYAMANGALAM-638 401 ..PETITIONER IN WP.6274/2003

VIJAY CEMENTS (P) LTD.,
THITLAKUDI ROAD,
KEELAMATHUR POST
ARIYALUR TALUK,
PERAMBALUR DISTRICT-621 713
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
KALIANNA ARUMUGAM ..PETITIONER IN WP.9036/2003

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

DEVI SPINNING MILLS
REP. BY MANAGER R.MANIVANNAN
SALEM HOSUR ROAD
VENNAMPATTI, DHARMAPURI. ..PETITIONER IN WP.9249/2003

FEMINA SPINNING MILLS LTD.,
THANNEERPANDANPATTU
BHOOTHAKUDI VILLAGE,
VIRALIMALAI-621 316
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
MR.S.M.I.MOHAMED ABUBACKER ..PETITIONER IN WP.9971/2003

PILLAIYARPATTIAR TEXTILES LTD.,
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
MR.N.M.MANTRI
UDAYANATHAPURAM CROSS
KANDAVARAYANPATTI
THIRUPATHUR,
SIVAGANGA DISTRICT. ..PETITIONER IN WP.14814/2003

M/S. BLUE BELL TEXTILES LTD.,
MULVOY VILLAGE, ARAKKONAM
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
N.VENUGOPAL ..PETITIONER IN WP.16097/2003

NATIONAL ENGINEERING COMPANY
LTD.,6TH FLOOR, 147, GREAMS ROAD
CHENNAI-6.REP. BY ITS AUTHORISED SIGNATORY
S.SANKAR. ..PETITIONER IN WP.725/2003

M.M.INDUSTRIES REP. BY ITS PROPRIETRIX
2, NEW STREET, BALAJI NAGAR
TIRUMULLAIVOYIL,
CHENNAI-62. ..PETITIONER IN WP.6614/2003

DIVYA SPINNING MILLS (P) LTD.,
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
MR.S.SUBRAMANI,S.F.NO.146, GOBI ROAD,
SANTHIPALAYAM,GETTICHEVIYUR-638 110
GOBI TALUK,ERODE DISTRICT. ..PETITIONER IN WP.12496/2003

JAIMURUGAN TEXTILES LTD.
NAVANI VILLAGE,
PUDUCHATRAM-637 018
NAMAKKAL DISTRICT
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR PL.RAMANATHAN ..PETITIONER IN WP.14166/2003

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

S.S.D.OIL MILLS CO. LTD.,
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR
D.RAMAMOORTHY NO.132, VILLAGE ROAD
IYYAPPANTHANGAL,
CHENNAI-600 056. ..PETITIONER IN WP.16456/2003

M/S.LAKSHMI SARASWATHI
SPINNING MILLS LTD.,
REP. BY THE TECHNICAL DIRECTOR
KUTCHIPALAYAM, THOKKAVADI (PO)
THIRUCHENGODU TALUK,
NAMAKKAL DISTRICT-637 209 ..PETITIONER IN WP.20080/2003

SONAL VYAPAR LTD.,
110/1D & 110/2, NATTAMANGALAM MAIN ROAD,
MANIANUR, SALEM-636 010
REP. BY ITS PRESIDENT
ARAVIND GUPTA ..PETITIONER IN WP.24262/2003

SALEM FOOD PRODUCTS REP. BY ITS PARTNER
ARAVIND GUPTA 67/2B, CALICUT MAIN ROAD
NETHIMEDU, SALEM-2 ..PETITIONER IN WP.24263/2003

KANISHK STEEL INDUSTRIES LTD.,
REP. BY ITS PRESIDENT ARAVIND GUPTA,
17, MOOKER NALLAMUTHU STREET
CHENNAI-1. ..PETITIONER IN WP.24264/2003

TRIVENI ALLOYS LTD. REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR
R.SRIRAM, CIT COLONY,
MYLAPORE, CHENNAI-4 ..PETITIONER IN WP.24265/2003

THE SOUTH INDIA STEEL AND STARCH INDUSTRIES,
REP. BY ITS PARTNER ARAVIND GUPTA
110/1B, NATTAMANGALAM MAIN ROAD
MARIANUR, SALEM-2 ..PETITIONER IN WP.24266/2003

EMERALD TEXTILES (P) LTD.,
VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR
R.R.BALARAMAN MANIPARAIPATTI,
NADAVAPATTI TALUK,
SATTUR TALUK. ..PETITIONER IN WP.24711/2003

CHOLA SPINNING MILLS PRIVATE
LTD., UNIT I, VEPPADI S.F.NO.189, REP. BY ITS
DIRECTOR K.KUMARASAMY KUMARAPALAYAM ROAD,
VEPPADI, ELLARTHAKOTTAI POST. ..PETITIONER IN WP.24712/2003

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

GVG INDUSTRIES (P) LTD.
DINDIGUL DISTRICT REP. BY ITS DEPUTY GENERAL MANAGER
MR.P.VENKATACHALAM SEMMADAIPATTI,
PALAKKANUTHU POST. ..PETITIONER IN WP.24713/2003

BHUVANESWARI TEXTILES (P) LTD.,
DINDIGUL REP. BY ITS CHAIRMAN
CUM MANAGING DIRECTOR
MR.R.R.ARVIND THADIKAMBU-624 709 ..PETITIONER IN WP.24714/2003

KARIKALI AMMAN SPINNING MILLS
(P) LTD. ELUMATHUR TO POONDURAI POST,
ELUMATHUR POST-638 104, MODAKKURICHI, ERODE DISTRICT
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR
MR.M.KARTHIKEYAN ..PETITIONER IN WP.24715/2003

PALMAR MILLS PVT. LTD. UNIT-II
LAKSHMIPURAM, SEETHIANKOTTAI 624 708,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT. SITHAYANKOTTAI REP. BY ITS
CHAIRMAN ..PETITIONER IN WP.24716/2003

O.P.STEELS LTD.,
17, MOOKER NALLAMUTHU STREET CHENNAI-1, REP. BY ITS
PRESIDENT ARAVIND GUPTA. ..PETITIONER IN WP.24717/2003

M/S.AYYAPPAN TEXTILES LTD.
REP. BY THE DIRECTOR RAMANATHAPURAM-623 502
ACHUTHAVAYAL ..PETITIONER IN WP.26250/2003

MOUNTAIN SPINNING MILLS LTD.
97/1A, KOOTTUVANKADU, MANGALAGIRI POST,
TUTICORIN-628 103 REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
V.ELANGO VETTIVEL. ..PETITIONER IN WP.26424/2003

THE TUTICORIN SPINNING MILLS LTD.
106, PALAYAMKOTTAI ROAD TUTICORIN-628 008
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
G.VETRIVEL. ..PETITIONER IN WP.26425/2003

ARASAN TEXTILE MILLS LTD.,
B UNIT, 97/1A, KOOTTUVANKADU,
MANGALAGIRI POST, TUTICORIN-628 103
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR V.SUBATHRA ..PETITIONER IN WP.26426/2003

ASSOCIATED STEEL RE-ROLLING MILLS
REP. BY ITS PARTNER S.V.SUDARSAN
111, ENNORE HIGH ROAD
KORRUKUPET, CHENNAI-21. ..PETITIONER IN WP.26592/2003

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

M/S. PLASTOMETAL
REP. BY THE PARTNER
AMBATTUR INDUSTRIAL ESTATE,
DEVELOPMENT, PLOT,
NO.59, AMBATTUR, CHENNAI-58. ..PETITIONER IN WP.26834/2003

M/S SAVORIT LIMITED - HT SC .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.26930 OF 2003
NO.1087 REP BY ITS DIRECTOR P.
MURUGESAN

M/S SAVORIT LIMITED-HT SC NO. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.27231 OF 2003
41 (UNITED INDIA FOODS) 131, TIRUCHI ROAD
DINDIGUL-624 001 BY DIRECTOR P.MURUGESAN.

K.T.SPINNING MILLS PVT.LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.27542 OF 2003
REP.BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR SRI.T.
DHANASEKARAN, VALASAIYUR, 636 122, SALEM DISTRICT.

SRIJANARTHANA SPINNING MILLS .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.27765 OF 2003
187, KANNAMAPALAYAM ROAD,
KARAMADAI, COIMBATORE DISTRICT-601 104.
PARTNER V.BALAKRISHNAN.

S.S.D.SPINNING MILLS LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.27848 OF 2003
REP.BY ITS MANAGER C.KATHIRESAN
MUTHALAPURAM, VILATTIKULAM TK,
TUTICORIN DISTRICT.

MOTHI SPINNERS LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.27865 OF 2003
REP.BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
M.CHANDRASEKAR
ATHIKATTUR PIRIVU, ANAGUR POST,
TIRUCHENGODE TK, NAMAKKAL DT.,

GANGOTRI TEXTILES LTD.UNIT IV .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.27866 OF 2003
REP.BY ITS FACTORY MANAGER
SM.MEIYAPPAN.
PUSHPATHUR VILLAGE, PALANI TK,
DINDIGUL DT-624 618.

HEMALATHA MILLS P.LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.27867 OF 2003
REP.BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR A.
KUMARASAMY, ARUMUTHAPALAYAM,
NARAYAURAM POST, PALADAM-641 664.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

M/S.JUMBO BAG LIMITED .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.27872 OF 2003
REP.BY ITS VICE-PRESIDENT MR.C.S.ANIL KUMAR,
PANJAFFY VILLAGE, PONNERI TK,
TIRUVALLUR DT,

SUGUVANESWARA SPINNING MILLS P .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.28101 OF 2003
PVT LTD REP BY IS M.D.SUNDARAVEL
VELLORE MAIN ROAD, SELLIAMPALAYAM,
MINNAMPALLI, SALEM.

JAI RENGA MILLS PVTLTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.28257 OF 2003
POST BOX NO 47 THENKASI ROAD RAJAPALAYAM
626 117 REP BY ITS M.D. K.J.RAVICHANDRA RAJA

A& S TEXTILES LTD UNIT-I .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.28258 OF 2003
23 SAWERIPALAYAM ROAD COIMBATORE 641 028 REP
BY ITS M.D.MR.SUREHSH KUMAR AGARWAL

KPR SPINNING PRIVATE LIMITED .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.28259 OF 2003
REGISTRATION OFFICE AT NO 9 A.K.S NAGAR
THADAGAM ROAD CBE -641 001
REPBY ITS DIRECTOR P.NATARAJ

K.P.R.MILL PRIVATE LIMITED .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.28260 OF 2003
INDIAMPALAYAM VILLAGE, ARASUR POST
SATHYAMANGALAM 638 454 REP BY ITS M.D. P.
NATARAJ

DIVYA SPINNING MILL (P) LTD .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.28927 OF 2003
GOBI ROAD SANTHIPALAYAM GETTICHEVIYUR
638 110 GOBI TALUK, ERODE REP BY ITS MD MR.S.
SUBRAMANI

SRI ANGALAPARAMESHWARI TEXTILE .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.29168 OF 2003
MILLS (P) LTD SF.NO.261 KOVAI ROAD
VELLAKOVIL 638 111ERODE REP.BY MR.S.KRISHNAN

SUBADRA SPINING MILS P.LTD .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.29742 OF 2003
VINNAVANUR PACHAL POST CHENGAM TK.
THIRUVANAMAMAL DT. -606 704
REP.BY ITS DIRECTOR V.S. RAJAGOPAL

NALLAM TEXTILES (P) LIMITED .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.29782 OF 2003
VELLAMADAI, OLAPALAYAM(PO)
KANGEYAM TALUK, ERODE
EORDE REP BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR MR.T.
SUBRAMANIAM

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

NALLAM MANIAM TEXTILES (P) .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.30048 OF 2003
LTD.1850-C ERAGAMPATTI KONARPATTI POST,
DHARAPURAM TK,REP BY ITS
MANAGING DIRECTOR MR.T.SUBRAMANIAM

K.T.V.OIL MILLS .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.30291 OF 2003
7/3, ARUL NAGAR SALAI,
KODANGAIYUR, CHENNAI 600 118
REP. BY ITS PARTNER K.T.V.KANNAN

PNR SPINNING MILLS(P) LTD .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.30292 OF 2003
NO.6, SAKTHI CO-OP INDUSTRIAL ESTATE
ELAYAMUTHUR ROAD, UDUMALPET,
COIMBATORE DISTRICT,
REP.BY MANAGING DIRECTOR MR.P.NATARAJAN

M/S.BLUE BELL TEXTILES LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.2196 OF 2003
MULVOY VILLAGE, ARAKKONAM
REP BY ITS M.D.N.VENUGOPAL.

HARI METAL & ALLOYS .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.2229 OF 2003
HOSUR, THALI ROAD, THENKANIKOTTA,
DHARMAPURI
REP BY N.HARI MANAGER

SRI VINAYAGA TEXTILES .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.25758 OF 2003
REP BY ITS SENIOR SPINNING MASTER N.ELANGO
(A UNIT OF BALAJI MODERN SPINNERS LTD)
SUKKAMANAICKEN PATTI VILLAGE,
CHINNAKALAYAMPUTHUR, PALANI-5,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT.

C.P.SPINNING MILLS PVT LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.25759 OF 2003
NEW DHARAPURAM ROAD,
PULIAMPATTI, PALANI TALUK,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
REP BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR P.BALAKRISHNAN

ANNAMALAIAR SPINNERS (P) LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.25760 OF 2003
PALAKKANUTHU 624 624
DINDIGUL, DINDIGUL DISTRICT
REP BY ITS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MR.S.JAYABALAN

SVA SYNTEX (P) LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.25761 OF 2003
REP BY ITS FACTORY MANAGER MR.G.R.DURAI
DINDIGUL PALANI MAIN ROAD,
THALAIYUTHU VILLAGE, NARICLEALPATTY POST
PALANI TALUK, DINDIGUL DISTRICT.

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

JAYAVARMA TEXTITLES (P) LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.25762 OF 2003
KUNNATHUR TO GOBI ROAD,
GHETTICHEVIYUR 638 110
ERODE DISTRICT
REP BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR MR.V.PALANISAMY

SVPB SPINNERS (P) LLTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.26310 OF 2003
REP BY ITS CHIEF ENGINEER (ELECTRICAL)
MR.V.VIJAYASEKARAN.
SEMMADAIPATTY, PALAKKANUTHU POST
DINDIGUL DISTRICT 624 624

SPICTEX COTTON MILLS LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.26311 OF 2003
REP BY ITS GENERAL MANAGER
MR.R.PITCHAIMANI,
KANNIVADI POST, CHINNA DHARAPURAM,
VIA DHARAPURAM TALUK, ERODE DISTRICT 639 202

D.S.METALS (P) LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.2435 OF 2003
A-15S SIPCOT INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX
GUMMIDIPOONDI CHENNAI REP.BY ITS
DIRECTOR RAJIV GOYAL.

M/S.V.R.FOUNDRIES .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.6344 OF 2003
83, PKV NAGAR,
COIMBATORE.4, PEELAMEDU.

M/S.THIAGARAJAR MILLS LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.6345 OF 2003
62, SINGANALLUR POST,
COIMBATORE.5.

M/S.CPC (P) LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.6346 OF 2003
207, METTUPALAYAM ROAD,
COIMBATORE.30.

SWAMINATHAN SPINNING MILLS .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.6879 OF 2003
PVT.LTD. REP BY ITS
MANAGING DIRECTOR MR.S.KUPPUSAMY
METTUPATTI, SALEM-636 111

M/S.RAMAKRISHNA MILLS .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.18874 OF 2003
(COIMBATORE) LTD.REP.BY ITS
VICE PRESIDENT PLANNING & FINANCE.
N.NAREBIMHALU, SATHI GOBI MAIN RD.,
ARIYAPPAMPALAYAM, SATHIYAMANGALAM-638 402

M/S.RAMAKRISHNA MILLS .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.18875 OF 2003
(COIMBATORE) LTD.REP.BY ITS

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

VICE PRESIDENT PLANNING & FINANCE
N.NARASIMHALU, SATHI, GOBI MAIN RD,
ARIYAPPAMPALAYAM, SATHIYAMANGALAM-638 402

SOUTHERN IRON AND STEEL .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.18997 OF 2003
COMPANY LTD. REP BY ITS COMPANY SECRY
& DGM (F&A)P.BOOPALAN
34, A.KAMARAJ RD,
COIMBATORE-641 018.

THE SOUTHERN TEXTILE LIMITED .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.20425 OF 2003
REP BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR N.VARADARAJAN
KAMMAMPALAYAM,SULUR, TIRCHI RD, COIMBATORE.

BMF BELTINGS LIMITED .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.20426 OF 2003
14, MECCALO IND-ESTATE, VELAPPANCHAVADI,
PH ROAD, CHENNAI-77
REP BY ITS COMPANY SECRETARY V.S.
KRISHNAMOORTHY

RAJNARAYAN HOSIERY EXPORTS .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.20427 OF 2003
(P) LTD. REP BY ITS MANAING DIRECTOR KASI
V.THIAGARAJAN, SF NO.37/1,
NARASIMANAIKKANPALAYAM, METTUPALAYAM RD,
COIMBATORE.

CARDWELL SPINNING MILLS LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.20428 OF 2003
REP BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR N.VARADARAJAN
PUDUPALAYAM, P.B.NO.4593, NGGO COLONY,
COIMBATORE.

HARI METAL & ALLOYS .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.21066 OF 2003
REP BY K.LNANDHA KISHORE PRODUCTION IN-
CHARGE, HOSUR THALI ROAD,
DENKIKOTLA, DHARMAPURI.

INDUS STEELS & ALLOYS PVT LTD .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.21067 OF 2003
REP BY ITS PRODUCTION MANAGER S.S.SRIKANTH
VLIVEERANAPALLI, HOSUR, THALI ROAD,
DENKENIKOTTAI, DHARMAPURI.

PONGALUR PIONEER TEXTILES .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.21126 OF 2003
P.LTD. REP.BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR.
V.SELVAPATHI, FLAT NO.6, SUNDARAM APARTMENTS,
83, RACE COURSE ROAD, COIMBATORE-18.

MILLION SPINNERS PVT.LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.21127 OF 2003
REP.BY ITS DIRECTOR V.SELVAPATHY
CHINNAVEERAMPATTI VILLAGE, UDUMALPET, COIMBATORE.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

M/S SRI VINAYAGA ALLOYS (P) LTD. REP BY THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
28/2A1, SALEM MAIN ROAD, AKKAMMAPET POST,
SAUKAI TK, SALEM-637 301 .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.21727 OF 2003

M/S N.G.A. STEELS (P) LTD.
REP BY THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
PAPPANKADU, KARUKKAMPALAYAM VILLAGE,
MORUR-637 304, SALEM DT. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.21728 OF 2003

M/S.SRI VIGNESWARA STEELS (P) LTD. REP BY ITS M.D.
SF 110/1A-1, MAVELIPALAYAM PIRIVU RD,
AKKMMAPATTI POST, SAUKAI TK,
SALEM 637 301 .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.21757 OF 2003

M/S.PAVAI ALLOYS AND STEELS P.LTD.REP BY THE M.D.
SF NO.433/4, ABCD, NALLERKANDAMPALAYAM,
PARAMATHY, VELLORE TK, 637 203, NAMAKKAL DT. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.21758 OF 2003

M/S.SRI KRISHNA ALLOYS
REP BY THE PARTNER
262/1B-3, MANCHAGALPATTI VILLAGE,
AKKAMMAPATTI POST, SALEM 637 301 .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.21759 OF 2003

M/S.ARASAN SYNTEX LTD.
REP.BY ITS ADMN.OFFICER.MR.N.KARTHIKEYAN
EPPODUMVENDRAN, TUTICORIN DISTRICT. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.21866 OF 2003

SITALAKSHMI MILLS LIMITED
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR MR.M.K.KALADHAR BABU
V.V.VAIT, ARASANUR, SIVAGANGA DISTRICT. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.22244 OF 2003

SITALAKSHMI MILLS LIMITED
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR MR.M.K.KALADHAR BABU
THIRUNAGAR, MADURAI. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.22245 OF 2003

BOJARAJ TEXTILE MILLS LTD.
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR MR.M.K.KALADHAR BABU
THENI, MADURAI. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.22246 OF 2003

M/S.SARAVANA SPINNING MILLS
REP.BY THE DIRECTOR.
CHOKKANPATTI POST,
DHARMAPURI-636 705,
VAIT OF KUMARAGIRI ELECTRONIC LTD .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.23568 OF 2003

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

M/S.KUMARAGIRI TEXTILES LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.23569 OF 2003
REP.BY THE DIRECTOR., PMP NAGAR,
CHOKKAMPATTI POST, DHARMAPURI – 636 705

D.S.METALS (P) LIMITED .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.23795 OF 2003
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR RAJIV GOYAL
A 15-S, SIPCOT INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX,
GUMMIDIPOONDI.

SUBBURAJ COTTON MILLS (P) LTD. .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.25273 OF 2003
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR A.SARAVANA KUMARM,
SRIVILLIPUTTUR ROAD, RAJAPALAYAM-626 117
VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT.

EXEL COTSPIN (INDIA) (P) LTD.,
SATHY KOVAI MAIN ROAD, SENBAGAPUDHUR POST,
SATHIYAMANGALAM 638402,ERODE DISTRICT.
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR A.P.AMMASIKUTTY
...PETITIONER IN WP.NO.25825/2003

CHERAN SPINNING MILLS (P) LTD
MINUKKAM PATTI POST, VEDASANDUR 624 711,
DINDIGAL. REP BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
A.P.AMMASIKUTTY ...PETITIONER IN WP.NO.25826/2003

SUBIKSHA SPINNERS LTD
DINDIGAL MADURAI ROAD, KALLUAM PATTI POST,
DINDIGUAL 624 005.REP BY ITS DIRECTOR L.SUBRAMANIAN,
...PETITIONER IN WP.NO.25827/2003

CHOLA TEXTILES (P) LTD
A.P.AMMASIKUTTY MINUKAMPATTI POST,
VEDASANDUR 624 711.
REP BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR ...PETITIONER IN WP.NO.25828/2003

M/S.A.R.METTALLURGICALS P.LTD
61 K.M.BANGALORE KRISHNAGIRI ROAD,
NALLAKONDAPALLI VILLAGE, SULAGIRI BLOCK,
HOSUR TK., DHARMAPURI DT. T.N 635 117.
REP.BY M.MURUGESAN MANAGER
... PETITIONER IN WP NO.21912 OF 2003

METTUR SPINNING MILLS LTD.
METTUR DAM, METTUR SALEM DISTRICT.
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR
P.BALAKRISHNAN .. PETITIONER IN WP NO.25885 OF 2003

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

EVERWIN TEXTILE MILL PVT LTD.,
NANJE GOUNDER PUDUR ACHIPATTI POST
642002. REP BY THE MANAGING DIRECTOR K.
PERIASAMY. ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.25886 OF 2003

DEVENTHIRA SPINNERS PVT LTD ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.25887 OF 2003
PADAVEDU VILLAGE, SANYASIPATTI POST
SANKARI (CO) - 637 306, NAMAKKAL
DISTRICT REP BY ITS DIRECTOR
R.P.PONGIANNAN

FEMINA SPINNING MILLS LTD. ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.26091 OF 2003
THANEER PANDAL PATTI BOOTHAKUDI,
VEERALIMALAI, 621 316, PADUKOTTAI
DISTRICT REP.BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
SMI. MD.ABUBACKAR.

RADHA TEXTILES P.LTD. ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.26092 OF 2003
KULITHALAI RD., KALATHUPATTI,
MANAPPARAI 621 306.
TRICHI DISTRICT.
REP.BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
M.SUBBIAH

PALANIAPPA TEXTILES P.LTD. ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.26093 OF 2003
KARUNGAL VILLAGE K.ANDIPATTI POST,
VEDASANDUR TK, 624 620,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
REP.BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
N.ESWARAMURTHY

SRI RATHINAGIRI SPINNERS P.LTD ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.26094 OF 2003
NH7 ROAD, KAKKA VADI VILLAGE, MANALMEDU POST,
KARUR 639 003.REP.BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
P.SIVASHANKAR,

KABILAN SPINNERS P.LTD. ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.9691 OF 2003
B-12 GANDHI NAGAR, UDUMALPET, 641 154.
REP.BY MANAGING DIRECTOR O.G.KANAGARAJAN.

JOTHI SPINNING MILLS,
ATTAYAMPATTI RD ...PETITIONER IN WP.NO.26759 OF 2003
ATTHANUR 636 301, RASIPURAM
TK, NAMAKAL DISTRICT
REP BY ITS MG PARTNER
R.AMITH PARASRAMPURIA

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

M/S.RUBY CHLORATES (P) LTD ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.26760 OF 2003
11B, SASTRI ROAD, TENNUR, TIRUCHES 620017.
TRICHY REP BY ITS MANAGING
DIRECTOR D. BASKARAN

CHOLA SPINNING MILLS
PRIVATE LIMITED - UNIT II ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.26761 OF 2003
SF NO.189/1, KUMARAPALAYAM ROAD, VEPPADI,
ELANTHAKOTTAI POST, ERODE 638 006.
ERODE REP BY ITS DIRECTOR K.KUMARASAMY

SRI SHARADA PARAMESHWARI ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.26762 OF 2003
TEXTILES LIMITED SF NO.87
MANICKA VINAYAGAR NAGAR, GUDALUR VILLAGE,
PERIANAICKNPALAYAM CBE 641 020.
COIMBATORE REP BY ITS DIRECTOR
R.RAMARAJ

ENGLISH TOOLS & CASTINGS ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.3168 OF 2003
PVT.LTD. 100/1A POLLACHI MAIN ROAD
THAMARAIKULAM POST
KINTHUKADAVA VIA POLLACHI DIRECTOR
M.KANAGARAJ COIMBATORE DISTRICT.

M/S KAMATCHI STEELS LTD ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.22807 OF 2003
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR
MR.VINOD KOTHARI
664 TH ROAD, TONDIARPET, CHENNAI 81.

M/S.SRI RAMAKRISHNA MILLS ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.23869 OF 2003
(COIMBATORE) LTD. REP BY ITS VICE PRESIDENT
PLANNING & FINANCE MR.N.NARASIMHALU
1493 SATHIYAMANGALAM ROAD, GANAPATHI,
CBE 641006.

M/S SWATHY PROCESSORS LTD. ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.23872 OF 2003
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR MR.N. NARASIMHALU
1493 SATHIYAMANGALAM ROAD, GANAPATHI,
CBE 641006.

M/S G.K.ALLOY STEELS PVT LTD ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.26194 OF 2003
REP BY ITS DIRECTOR K.VENKATESH
217 VELLAYATHAPALAYAM, AVINASHI 641654.

M/S.SREE KARTHIKEYA INDUSTRIES ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.27477 OF 2003
REP.BY ITS PARTNER P.ANBALAGAN.
87 & 132 SIP CO IND ESTATE, RANIPET 632 403
VELLORE DISTRICT.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

M/S.RAMBO PACKERS (I) PVT.LTD ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.27478 OF 2003
REP.BY ITS DIRECTOR YATHISTHIR MATHANY
F 29 SIPCOT IND ESTATE, GUMMIDIPOONDI.

M/S SUPER STAR POLYMERS PVT ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.29462 OF 2003
LTD REP BY ITS DIRECTOR A.C. JYOTHI
1/231 NAGARI PALLIPATTU MAIN ROAD,
NEDIUM VILLAGE & POST,
PALLIPATTU TK, TIRUVALLUR DISTRICT.

ALAGAMMAI COTTON MILLS (P) LTD ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.30477 OF 2003
KAYAVAYAL SHANMUGANATHAPURAM 630 314.
SIVAGANGA DISTRICT REP BY ITS MANAGING
DIRECTOR RM.ARUNASALAM

SRI RANGANATHAN INDUSTRIES ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.26414 OF 2003
P) LTD. 12/45 THADAGAM MAIN ROAD,
EDAYAR PALAYAM CBE 641025.
REP BY ITS GENERAL MANAGER M.GOVIND

SAKTHI TRADING COMPANY ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.27760 OF 2003
NO.6 MAMARATHUPALAYAM
ERODE 4, PROP PC DURAISAMY

SAKTHI MASALA(P) LTD ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.27761 OF 2003
SF 1052/56 PERUMAPALAYAM,
MULLANPATTI, ERODE 638 107,
MG DIR PP. DURAISAMY

DURAISAMY FEEDS & SPICES(P)LTD ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.27762 OF 2003
SF 1052/134 & 5 PERUMAPALAYAM,
MULLANPATTI, ERODE 638 107,
MG DIR PP. DURAISAMY

CHEMTECH PROCESSORS ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.27763 OF 2003
779 KANCHEEPURAM NALLUR
TIRUPPUR 6.
REP BY ITS PARTNER KL PALANISAMY,

K.K.S.KHADER MOHIDEEN SAHIB ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.27764 OF 2003
SONS 15 EM.BALASUBRAMANIAN ST THIRUNAGAR,
COLONY ERODE 3 REP BY ITS
PARTNER K.AHAMED SHEIK MOHIDEEN

ACQUASUB ENGINEERING ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.28163 OF 2003
THUDIALUR COIMBATORE-34 REP BY
MANAGING PARTNER R.KUMARAVELU

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

ACQUASUB ENGINEERING ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.28164 OF 2003
UNIT II 307-308 VETHALIKALIPALAYAM
COIMBATORE 31 REP BY MANAGING PARTENER R.
KUMARAVELU

ACQUAPUMP INDUSTRIES ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.28165 OF 2003
THUDIALUR COIMBATORE 34 REP BY
MANAGING PARTENER R.KUMARAVELU

ACQUASUB ENGINEERING ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.28166 OF 2003
UNIT III THUDIALUR
COIMBATORE 34 REP BY
MANAGING PARTENER
R.KUMARAVELU

WENDT INDIA LIMITED ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.31859 OF 2003
SIPCOT IND ESTATE COMPLEX,
HOSUR, DHARPURI DISTRICT.
REP BY ITS GENL MANAGER
RAJESH KHANNA.

SRI BALASUBRAMANIYAR SPINNING ...PETITIONER IN WP.NO.43663/02
& WEAVING MILLS (P) LTD
REP BY MG DIRECTOR 174 CHENGAM RD
TV MALAI 606 603.

M/S.PLASTOMETAL ... PETITIONER IN WP NO.12006 OF 2004
REP.BY THE PARTNER.
AMBATTUR IND ESTATE DEVELOPMENT
PLOT NO.59 AMBATTUR CH 58

VS

THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU
REP BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVT.,
ENERGY DEPARTMENT
FORT ST GEORGE, CHENNAI 9. ...1ST RESPONDENT IN WA.NO.1513/04,
2166 TO 2170 2509 TO 2513, 2560 TO
2564, 1368, 1373, 1374, 1399, 1403,
1509, 1610, 1698, 1708, 1729, 1734,
1851 TO 1855, 1870 TO 1874, 1727, 2634
TO 2638/2004.

...R1 IN WPS.566/03, 567, 568, 2129, 2881, 2996 TO 2998, 12816, 13344, 12101, 12102, 19873 TO 19875, 2456, 24818, 24819, 24925, 24928, 25134 TO 25136, 25169/03, 25236, 25357, 25364 TO 25369, 25435, 25436, 25471, 25639, 25640, 25697, 25829 TO 25833, 25891, 25892, 26024 TO 26027, 26930, 8362, 26675/03, 37273 TO 37275/02, 38663, 42130/02, 42131, 42915, 42916,

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

43898/02, 43899, 44028, 44329, 45082, 45083, 42098 TO 42100, 42605, 43727/02; 726/03 TO 728, 849, 85/03, 21155/02, 43224 TO 43232/02 7819/03 9396 TO 9398/03, 1595, 1206 TO 1210/03 2722 TO 2725/03 5837, 6274, 9036, 9249, 9971, 14814, 16097, 725/03, 12496, 14166, 16456, 20080, 24262 TO 24266, 24711 TO 24717, 26250, 26424 TO 26426, 26592, 26834, 27231, 27542, 27765, 27848, 27865 TO 27867, 27872, 28101, 28257 TO 28260, 28927, 29168, 29742, 29782, 30048, 30291, 30292, 2196, 2229, 25758, 25762, 26310, 26311, 2435, 6344 TO 6346, 6879, 18874, 18875, 18997, 20425 TO 20428, 21126, 21127, 21727, 21728, 21757 TO 21759, 21866, 22244, 22246, 23568, 23569, 23795, 25273, 25825 TO 25828 25885 TO 25887, 26091 TO 26094, 9691, 26759 TO 26762, 3168, 22807, 23869, 23872, 26194, 27477, 27478, 29462, 30477, 26414, 27760 TO 27764, 28163 TO 28166, 31859/03, 43663/02 AND 12006/2004.

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY BOARD,
REP BY ITS CHAIRMAN,
800, ANNA SALAI, CHENNAI 600002. ...2ND RESPONDENT IN
WA.NOS.1513/04, 2166 TO 2170 2509
TO 2512, 2560 TO 2564, 1368,
1373, 1374, 1399, 1403, 1509,
1698, 1708, 1729, 1734, 1851 TO
1855, 1870 TO 1874, 1727, 2634
TO 2638/2004 AND R3 IN WA.2513/04

...R2 IN WPS.566/03, 568, 2129, 2881, 2996 TO 2998, 5980, 12816, 13344, 12101, 12102, 19873 TO 19875, 24560, 24818, 24819, 24925, 24928, 25134 TO 25136, 25169, 25236, 25357, 25435, 25471, 25697 25891, 25892, 8362, 26675, 42130, 42131, 42915, 42916, 43898/02, 43899, 44028, 44329, 45082, 45083, 42098, 42099, 42100/02, 42605, 43727; 726/03 TO 728, 849, 850, 43224 TO 43232/02 7819 9396 TO 9398/03, 10595, 1206 TO 1210/03 2722 TO 2725/03 5837/03, 6274, 9036, 9249, 9971, 14814, 725, 6614/03, 12496 14166, 20080, 24262 TO 24266, 24711 24717, 26250, 26424 TO 26426, 26592, 26834, 27231, 27542, 27765, 27848, 27865 TO 27867, 27872, 28101, 28257 TO 28260, 29168, 29742, 29782, 30048, 30291, 30292, 2229, 25759, 2435, 6344 TO 6346, 6879, 18874, 18875, 20425 TO 20428, 21126, 21127, 21727, 21728, 21757 TO 21759, 22244, 22246, 23568, 23569, 23795, 25273, 25885 TO 25886 25887 9691, 26759 TO 26762, 3168, 23869, 23872, 26194, 27477, 27478, 29462, 26414, 27760 TO 27764, 28163 TO 28166, 31859/03, 43663/02 AND 12006/2004.

...R3 IN WPS.25364 TO 25369, 25436, 25639, 25640, 25829 TO 25833, 26024 TO 26027, 26930, 24173 TO 24716, 28927, 25758, 25760, 25762, 26310, 26311, 25825 TO 25828, 26091, 26092, 26093, 26094, 30477/2003.

2. THE CHAIRMAN
TNEB KRR MAALIGAI
CHENNAI 1. ...2ND RESPONDENT IN WA.NO.1610/2004
37273/2002 TO 37275/02, 38663/02,
21155/02, 16456/02, 18997, 21866,
22807/03

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

THE GOVT. OF TAMIL NADU, REP. BY
ITS SECRETARY TO GOVT.,
PUBLIC WORKS (ELECTRICAL) DEPARTMENT,
FORT ST. GEORGE, CHENNAI 9. ..1ST RESPONDENT IN WA.NO. 6614/03 AND WP.NO.5980/2003.

THE TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION,
REP. BY THE SECRETARY,
17, THIRD MAIN RAOD,
SEETHAMMAL COLONY, ALWARPET,
CHENNAI 18. ..1ST RESPONDENT IN WP.26622/03, 21066, 21067/03, 21912/03.

2ND RESPONDENT IN WA.2513/04
2ND RESPONDENT IN WP.NOS.25364 TO 25369, 25436, 25639, 25640, 25829 TO 25833, 26024 TO 26027, 26930, 24713, 24714, 24715, 24716, 28927, 25158, 25760, 25761, 25762, 26310, 26311, 25825 TO 25828, 26091, 26092, 26093, 26094, 30477/03.

..3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.16097

..4TH RESPONDENT IN WP.25169, 25236, 25891, 25892, 26250, 26834, 28258, 21727, 21728, 21757 TO 21759, 23568, 23569.

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
COIMBATORE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION
CIRCLE(5),
COIMBATORE 641 012. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WPS.566, 13344, 25134, 25136, 42131, 27713/03.

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
COIMBATORE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
(METRO), TATABAD,
COIMBATORE. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WA.1509 IN WPS.567, 12102, 25135, 25169, 23259/03, 23869, 6344 TO 6346.

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER/
COIMBATORE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION
CIRCLE (NORTH), COIMBATORE. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WA.568, 25697, 43898/02, 42100, 43229, 23872/02.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

THE ACCOUNTS OFFICER,
O/O.THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
C & E ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE(NORTH),
COIMBATORE. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.26194/03.

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
THUDIALUR ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
THUDIALUR, COIMBATORE. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.43227/02.

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY BOARD,
METTUR ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
METTUR. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WA.NOS.1698, 1708, 1729, 1734, 1727
WPS.12101, 25831, 20080, 18997, 21727, 21728, 21757 TO 21759, 25885.

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
METTUR ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
SALEM DISTRICT. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.NO.44329/02.

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY BOARD,
KARUR ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
KARUR. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.19873, 43230,
4TH RESPONDENT IN WP.NO.26094/00.

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER/
THE ADDL. CHIEF ENGINEER,
DHARMAPURI ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
DHARMAPURI. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.19874, 24818, 24819, 25236, 43228, 9249, 2229, 23568, 23569, 31859/03.

2ND RESPONDENT IN WP.21066, 21067, 21912
4TH RESPONDENT IN WP.25830,

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
MADURAI ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION
CIRCLE, MADURAI R3 IN WP.19875, 42915/02, 22245

THE SUPERINDENDING ENGINEER,
CHENNAI ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE
(N) CHENNAI. R3 IN WA.NOS.1870 AND 1873, 25357/03 25471
R3 IN WP.NOS.24560, 5837, 24264, 24265, 24717, 26592, 29168, 30291, 23795, 22807,
R4 IN WP.26930

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY BOARD,
COIMBATORE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
COIMBATORE. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.NOS.43224 TO 43226/02, 43231, 43232/02, 27765/03. 27867/03, 20425, 20427, 20428/03, 21126, 26762, 26414/03, 28163 TO 28166/03.

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
K.K.NAGAR, CHENNAI (S),
CHENNAI. ..2ND RESPONDENT IN WP.38663,
3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.16456,
37275/02.

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
ERODE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
ERODE. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WA.1373 AND
3RD RESPONDENT IN WPS.24925, 24928, 24712, 29782, 27764, AND 4TH RESPONDENT IN WP. 25825, 24715, 26311

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
DINDIGUL ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
DINDIGUL. ..4TH RESPONDENT IN WA.2513/04, AND 3RD RESPONDENT IN WPS.25435, 25759/03, 27231, 27866, &
4TH RESPONDENT IN WPS.25364, 25365, 25366, 25367 25368, 25369,25436, 25639, 25640, 25829, 25832, 25833, 26024, 26025, 24713, 24714, 24716, 25758, 25760, 25761, 26310, 25826 TO 25828, 26093, 30477

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
SALEM ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
SALEM 14. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WA.1368, 1374 AND
2ND RESPONDENT IN WPS.26622/03, AND
3RD RESPONDENT IN WPS.25891, 25892, 44028, 24262, 24263, 24266, 27542, 28101, 6879.
4TH RESPONDENT IN WP.26026/03.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER/
THE CHIEF ADDL. ENGINEER,
TUTICORIN ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
TUTICORIN. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WPS.26675/03, 37273, 37274, 38663/02, 21155/02, 26424 TO 26426, 27848, 21866

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
UDUMALPET ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
UDUMALPET. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WA.NO.1513/04
3RD RESPONDENT IN WPS.42130, 43899/02, 45082, 45083, 42098, 30048, 30292, 21127, 9691, 3168

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
SIVAGANGAI ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
SIVAGANGAI DISTRICT. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.42916/02, 43727/02, 14814, 22244

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
GOBI ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
GOBI, ERODE DISTRICT ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WPS.42099/02, 28260, 18874 AND 18875
AND 4TH RESPONDENT IN WPS.28927, 25762

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
GOBI ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
GOBI. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.7819/03, 6274/00

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,(TNEB)
VIRUDHUNAGAR ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WPS.42605, 24711, 28257, 25273/03.

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
VELLORE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
VELLORE. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WPS.27477
2ND RESPONDENT IN WP.16097/2003
AND 2196

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
TIRUVANNAMALAI ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
TIRUVANNAMALAI. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WPS.29742, 43663/02.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
[TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY BOARD],
RAMNAD DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
RAMANATHAPURAM. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.26250/03.

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY BOARD,
CHENNAI (W) DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
CHENNAI (W). ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WPS.26834, 20426 AND 12006/2004.

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
NAMAKKAL ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
NAMAKKAL. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WPS.27865, 25886, 25887, 26759, 26761.

THE ASST. ENGINEER[O & M),
TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY BOARD,
PAUJETTY VILLAGE,
PONNERI TALUK,
TIRUVALLUR DISTRICT. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.27872

THE CHIEF ELECTRICAL INSPECTOR TO GOVT.,
THIRU-VI-KA INDUSTRIAL ESTATE,
GUINDY, CHENNAI 32. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.28258

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
THENI ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
THENI. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.22246/03.

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
PUDUKOTTAI ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
PUDUKOTTAI. ..4TH RESPONDENT IN WP.26091

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
(METRO) ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
TIRUCHY. ..4TH RESPONDENT IN WPS.26092
3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.NO.26760/03.

THE ADDL SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
(METRO) SIPCOT INDUSTRIAL ESTATE,
GUMMIDIPOONDI. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.27478/03.

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, TNEB
KANCHIPURAM ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
KANCHIPURAM. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.29462/03.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
[TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY BOARD],
CHITTODE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION CIRCLE,
CHITHODE. ..3RD RESPONDENT IN WP.27760/03 27761/03 AND 27762/03.

Appearance:
For Appellants - Writ Appeals:

Mr.R.S.Pandiaraj ..2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2509 to 2513, 2560 to 2564, 1851 to 1855, 1870 to 1874, 2634 to 2638/04.

Mr.Kamalanathan ..1513, 1368, 1373, 1374, 1399, 1403, 1509/2004.

Mr.M.Dd.Ibrahim Ali ..1610/2004.

Mr.S.Sivanandam ..1698, 1708, 1729, 1734, 1727/04.

Writ Petitions [For petitioners]

Mrs.R. Hemalatha ..566 to 568/03, 18874, 18875, 23869, 23872/04.

Mr.R.S.Pandiaraj ..2129, 2881, 2996 to 2998/03, 12816/03, 24925, 25364 to 25369, 25435, 25436, 25639, 25640, 25697, 25829 to 25833, 26024 to 26027, 26930, 8362/03, 726 to 728/03, 849, 850/03, 9396 to 9368/03, 10595, 1206 to 1210, 2722 to 2725/03, 9036/03, 9971, 725/03, 12496, 14166, 24262 to 24266/03, 24711 to 24717 to 24717/03, 27231, 27848, 27865 to 27867, 28927, 29168, 30291, 30292, 25788 to 25762, 26310, 26311, 2435, 23795, 25273, 25825 to 25828, 25885 to 25887, 26091 to 26094, 26759 to 26762, 30477

Mr.T.S.Sivagnanam ..5980, 6614/03.

Mr.S.Silambanan ..13344, 28257 to 28260, 29782, 30048

Mrs.Nalini Chidambaram Sr. Counsel
for Mr.M. Kamalanathan ..12101, 12102/03, 42130/02, 42131, 42915, 42916/02 43898, 43899, 44329/02, 45082, 45083/02, 42098 to 42100/02, 42605, 43727, 7819/03, 27542, 5837, 6274, 14814, 27542, 28101, 6344 to 6346, 6879, 9691

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

Mr.Palani Selvaraj ..19873 to 19875, 25134 to 25136, 43224 to 43232, 26424 to 26426, 27765, 29742, 20425 to 20428, 21126, 21127, 3168, 26414, 27760 to 27764, 28163 to 28166, 31859/03.

Mr.S.Kirubanandam ..24560, 25236

Mr.K.JayaChandran .. 24818,24819,25357,22807,26194.

Mr.V.Seenjeevi .. 24928.

Mr.S.Sivanandam .. 25169,25891,25892,44028/02,20080/03 26250,26834/03,21727,21728,21757 to 21759,23568,23569,12006/04,43663/02.

Mr.P.Jagadeesan .. 25471/03.

Mr.C.S.Krishnamoorthy .. 26622,9249,2229,21912.

Mr.V.Bharathidasan .. 26675/03

Mr.M.Md.Ibrahim Ali .. 37273 to 37275/02,38663,21155/02,16456/03.

Mr.G.Jeremiah .. 16097/03,2196.

Mr.P.Jagadeesan .. 26592/03

Mr.S.Kamadevan .. 27872/03

Mr.S.K.Nachimuthu .. 18997/03

Mr.Navin Durai Babu .. 21066,21067.

Mr.T.Karthikeyan .. 21866/03

Mr.V.Ramajagadeesan .. 22244 to 22246/03

Mr.Md.Riyaz .. 27477,27478,29462.

Writ Appeals & Writ Petitions
For Respondents.

WEB COPY

Mr.V.Ragupathy
Government Pleader
for Energy Department in all the cases.

Mr.R.Muthukumaraswamy
Additional Advocate General assisted
by M/S.G.Vasudevan & N.Srinivasan(for TNEB) in all the cases.

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

Writ Appeals filed Under Clause 15 of Letters Patent against Order dated 6.11.2003 passed by this Court in W.P.Nos

W.A.NO.2166/2004	Dated 6.11.2005	W.P.No.43807/2002
W.A.NO.2167/2004	Dated 6.11.2005	W.P.No.43809/2002
W.A.NO.2168/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.No.44570/2002
W.A.NO.2169/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.5748/2003
W.A.NO.2170/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.80/2003
W.A.NO.2509/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.43633/2002
W.A.NO.2510/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.44362/2002
W.A.NO.2511/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.43031/2002
W.A.NO.2512/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.43631/2002
W.A.NO.2513/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.24836/2003
W.A.NO.2560/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.93/2003
W.A.NO.2561/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.46644/2002
W.A.NO.2562/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.44105/2002
W.A.NO.2563/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.43808/2002
W.A.NO.2564/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.44097/2002
W.A.NO.1513/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.1763/2003
W.A.NO.1368/2005	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.45830/2002
W.A.NO.1373/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.42536/2002
W.A.NO.1374/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.45829/2002
W.A.NO.1399/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.42570/2002
W.A.NO.1403/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.42535/2002
W.A.NO.1509/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.3269/2003
W.A.NO.1610/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.41643/2002
W.A.NO.1698/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.45788/2002
W.A.NO.1708/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.42565/2002
W.A.NO.1729/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.45787/2002
W.A.NO.1734/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.45791/2002
W.A.NOs.1851 to	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.43036/2002
1852/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.45324/2002
1853/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.46121/2002
1854/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.44364/2002
1855/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.43033/2002
W.A.NO.1870/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.24393/2003
W.A.NO.1871/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.42585/2002
W.A.NO.1872/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.45937/2002
W.A.NO.1873/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.24392/2003
W.A.NO.1874/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.45667/2002
W.A.NO.1727/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.45793/2002
W.A.NO.2634/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.43581/2002
W.A.NO.2635/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.46641/2002
W.A.NO.2636/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.6354/2003
W.A.NO.2637/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.85/2003
W.A.NO.2638/2004	Dated 6.11.2003	W.P.NO.43035/2002

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

Prayer : The above said Writ Petition filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue Writs of declaration, Certiorarified Mandamus, Certiorari, Mandamus etc. as stated therein.

J U D G M E N T

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

This batch of writ appeals and writ petitions involve common questions of fact and law and they are therefore disposed off by this common judgment.

2. The challenge in these cases is to the levy of peak hour charges at 20% etc per unit over and above the normal rate for consumption of electricity consumed by High Tension consumers during peak hours i.e. between 6.00 a.m. and 9.00 a.m. and 6.00 p.m. to 9.00 p.m.

3. The writ appeals have been filed against the impugned judgment of the learned single Judge of this Court dated 06.11.2003.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties, and perused the record.

5. The petitioner in W.P.No. 1763 of 2003 (which we have treated as the leading case), namely, M/s.Magna Electro Castings Limited has prayed for a writ of declaration to quash clause 'd' of the High Tension Tariff I to the schedule of the Tamil Nadu Electricity Revision of Tariff Rates on Supply of Electrical Energy Act, 1978 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tamil Nadu Act of 1978') by which peak hour charges have been imposed as null and void and for a mandamus directing the respondents to refund to the petitioner the peak hour charges said to have been illegally collected so far from the month of August 1997 or adjust the same in future bills.

6. The petitioner in W.P.No. 1763 of 2003 is a Public Limited Company and is a consumer from the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board having service connection No.176 within Udumalpet Electricity Distribution Circle. The service connection is high tension having a load of 1750 KVA. The petitioner is engaged in manufacturing iron castings.

7. The petitioner is a manufacturing industry, which obtained high tension power connection under Tariff I as per the schedule to the Tamil Nadu Act of 1978.

8. The legislative entry relating to electricity is Entry 38 List – III of the 7th Schedule to the Constitution. Hence both Parliament and the State Legislature can enact laws relating to electricity.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

9. Section 49(1) of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948, which is a parliamentary law, provided for the respective State Electricity Boards to fix uniform tariffs. However, the Tamil Nadu Act of 1978 which was passed subsequently by the Tamil Nadu Legislature, and received the assent of the President of India on 25.02.1997 also provides for fixing the electricity tariff (in Tamil Nadu), and hence it prevails over the provisions of Section 49 of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 in view of Article 254(2) of the Constitution.

10.Sections 3 and 4 of Tamil Nadu Act of 1978 state as follows: -

> " 3. Tariff rates for consumption of electrical energy. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Tamil Nadu Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Act, 1949 (Tamil Nadu Act XXIX of 1949),the tariff rates payable to Tamil Nadu Electricity Board by any consumer on the electrical energy supplied by the Board shall be as specified in the schedule to this Act.
>
> 4. Power of the State to amend the Schedule: - The State Government may after taking into account the cost of production of energy, and such other matters as may be prescribed, by notification, amend the provisions of the Schedule to this Act."

11. Part – A of the Schedule to Tamil Nadu Act of 1978 mentions the electricity tariff relating to high tension supply as envisaged in Section 3. In exercise of the power conferred on the State Government by Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Act of 1978, the State Government issued G.O.Ms.No.17 dated 14.2.1997, which amended the High Tension tariff by inserting the following clause: -

> " High Tension Tariff: -
>
> (d) For the High Tension Industrial Consumers, Time of the Day meter shall be provided. On installation of Time of the Day meters, the High Tension Industrial Consumers shall be billed at 20 per cent extra on the energy charges for the energy recorded during peak load hours. The duration of peak load hours shall be as under: -
>
> (1)6.00 a.m. to 9.00 a.m.
>
> (2)6.00 p.m. to 9.00 p.m."

12. The aforesaid amendment to the schedule by G.O.Ms.No.17 dated 14.2.1997 has been challenged in these petitions/appeals.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

13. It is alleged by the petitioners/appellants that peak hour extra charge at 20% during the peak hours mentioned in clause 'd ' to High Tension Tariff is highly arbitrary, illegal and discriminatory.

14. It is alleged that the petitioner industry is a power oriented factory and the main raw material itself is the high tension power and the industry has to be operated continuously for 24 hours a day. The manufacturing process is a continuous uninterrupted process and hence classification of peak hours and the extra charges of 20 % for the petitioner industry is illegal. It is alleged that the classification of high tension and low tension is permitted and the further classification of Tariff I to V is also permitted. However, it is contended that 20% extra charge for peak hours consumption to the High Tension tariff I is not permitted under law and is discriminatory and is highly arbitrary. It is alleged that the peak hour charge causes great financial burden on the petitioner, which it is unable to bear.

15. We have also perused the common counter affidavit filed on behalf of the first respondent in the writ petitions.

16. In paragraph-12 of the counter affidavit it is stated that the peak load mainly occurs due to usage of load by domestic consumers and agricultural consumers during 6.00 a.m. to 9.00 a.m. and mainly by lighting loads of domestic consumers and commercial establishments during 6.00 p.m. to 9.00 p.m. These usages are meant for the self consumption of the users and cannot be postponed or rearranged. It is contended that the only possible way to deal with this heavy load at peak hours is to regulate the usage of industrial consumers who avail supply throughout. Also, the industrial consumers use electricity for production of certain commodities which bring profit to them and hence the usage by this category could be rearranged or they have to pay more for their use during the peak hours. It is stated that already there is peak load restriction for the Low Tension power loads during evening peak hours i.e., from 18.00 hrs to 22.00 hrs. It is contended that instead of restricting the usage of electricity by the High Tension Industrial Consumers, they have been levied with additional peak load charges, so that if they want they can use the power by paying increased rate or they may postpone the usage to the non peak hour. The levy of peak hour charges will therefore act as a disincentive for usage of electricity during peak hours.

17. It is further stated in the counter affidavit that the demand of the grid varies during the day depending on the electricity consumed by various categories of consumers. While the Industries consume electricity throughout the day, the additional demand that occurs due to pumping load, the domestic consumption and commercial activities requires electricity during limited specified hours of the day. The single shift industries and two shift industries also contribute to the increase in demand during their period of operation. The grid demand also varies with the season

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

such as festival season and monsoon season. During summer months, the demand is more due to irrigation demand, air conditioning load, longer duration of domestic load due to examinations, special programme in Television and the usage of fans etc.

18. On a consideration of these facts it appears that the purpose of levying peak hour charges is to make the load curve uniform, and for this the usage during peak hours has to be curbed and usage during off peak hours has to be encouraged.

19. In paragraph 21 of the counter affidavit it is stated that during peak hours pumped storage schemes and high cost generating plants are brought into service with maximum import from other feeding sources (Central Generating Stations and Import from other States) to meet out the peak load demand. It is stated that this involves additional expenditure. It is further stated that to meet this demand 20% extra levy is imposed on the consumers on the consumption at peak hours so as to transfer the burden to other class of consumers who are not bulk consumers of electricity. This is also to induce the consumers to avail load during non peak hours which will help the Board to restrict the import of electricity from other States and Central Generating Stations and to desist from the operation of high cost pumped storage generating stations.

20. In paragraph 22 of the counter affidavit it is stated that during peak hours supply cannot be maintained at the desired frequency to all consumers with inherent generation alone. Power has to be imported from other sources (from other State's Generating Stations and from Central Generating Stations) to supply power at the desired frequency to all consumers. This involves more expenditure. Based on the Government Order No.17 dated 14.2.97, even continuous process industries are not exempted and they have to pay the peak hour charges for their consumption.

21. In paragraph-23 of the counter affidavit it is stated that the Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission, in its first tariff order issued on 15.3.2003 has ruled that peak demands during morning and evening peak hours occur in Tamil Nadu Electricity Board's transmission grid. The peak demand determines the capacity of generation requirement. A reduction in peak demand would allow the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board to reduce power purchase, generation costs and reduce the overall cost of supply. The Commission felt that the current disincentives in the tariff rates to avail supply during peak hours should continue and incentives to avail supply during non peak hours should be introduced. Accordingly, the Commission in its Tariff Order dated 15.3.2003 has ordered to bill 20% extra on the energy charges for the peak hour consumption and introduced a rebate of 5% for High Tension Industrial Consumers for consumption during 2200 to 0500 hrs (off peak period).

22. It is alleged in paragraph 25 of the counter affidavit that if the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board is not allowed to collect peak hour

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

charges it will end up with huge losses. Unless peak hour charges are permitted the petitioners and other consumers similar to them will use the energy during peak hours causing hardship to the public for getting electricity at the desired frequency.

23. From the facts stated above, it appears that during the period between 6.00 a.m. to 9.00 a.m. the usage of electricity rises significantly because of the use by domestic and agricultural consumers, and similarly during the period between 6.00 p.m. to 9.00 p.m. the usage of electricity rises due to usage by domestic and commercial consumers. The purpose of levying peak hour charges is to act as a disincentive for usage of electricity during peak hours by high tension consumers who consume the major portion of electricity. Hence a separate tariff has been envisaged to reduce the demand during this period.

24. Learned counsels for the appellants submitted that G.O.Ms.No.17 dated 14.2.1997 was illegal as it did not receive the assent of the President of India under Article 254(2) of the Constitution of India.

25. In our opinion there is no merit in this contention. It has been held by a Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court in K.S.E.Board v. Indian Aluminum Co., (AIR 1976 SC 1031) (vide paragraph 12) that Article 254(2) does not contemplate Presidential Assent to notifications issued under the Act. The Article contemplates Presidential Assent only to laws made by the legislature of a State.

Some learned counsel pleaded promissory estoppel but this plea has been rejected by a Division Bench of this Court in Shanmugaraja Spinning Mills (P) Ltd, Rep. by P.S.K.Shanmugarajan, its Managing Partner v. The Superintending Engineer (i/e) Periyar Electricity System, Erode and Others, 2002 I MLJ 285

26. Learned counsel for some of the petitioners contended that under Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Act of 1978, the State Government has to take into account the cost of production. It is submitted that since the cost of production is the same through out the day there cannot be any justification for levying peak hour charges. In our opinion, there is no merit in this contention also. The purpose of levying peak hour charges is to act as a disincentive to use of electricity during peak hours. The alternative would be to impose power cut as the consumption rises during peak hours. However instead of resorting to power cut the Government and the Board decided to reduce the consumption during peak hours by imposing peak hour charges. In our opinion, this is a policy decision of the State, and this Court cannot interfere with such policy decisions.

27. In M/s.Hindustan Zinc Limited v. Andhra Pradesh State Electricity Board, AIR 1991 SC 1473 (vide paragraph 24), a similar argument was raised before the Supreme Court that there was discrimination since the burden of the rise in fuel cost was placed only on the High

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

Tension Consumers. The Supreme Court rejecting the submission observed that high tension industries are known power guzzlers, and hence they form a distinct class separate from other consumers like low tension consumers, and there is rational nexus to the object sought to be achieved. Hence there was no discrimination.

28. Similarly in A.C.Mills v. A.P.S.E Board, AIR 1976 SC 2414 the Supreme Court observed that there can be reasonable classification for fixing electricity tariff and there is no violation of Article 14 of the Constitution. It was observed that equality before law does not mean that things which are different shall be treated as though they were the same.

29. Similarly in Association of Industrial Electricity Users v. State of A.P., (2002) 3 SCC 711, the Supreme Court observed: -

> " We are also unable to agree with the learned counsel for the appellants that the Act does not envisage classification of consumers according to the purpose for which electricity is used. Sub-section (9) of Section 26 does state that the tariff which is fixed shall not show undue preference to any consumer of electricity but then the said sub section itself permits differentation according to the consumer's load factor or power factor, consumer's total consumption of energy during the specified period, time at which the supply is required or paying capacity of category of consumers and the need for cross-subsidisation or such tariff as is just and reasonable and be such as to promote economic efficiency in the supply and consumption of electricity and the tariff may also be such as to satisfy all other relevant provisions of the Act and the conditions of the relevant licence."

30. It was then contended that high tension industries should not have been singled out for discriminatory treatment. In our opinion, since high tension industries are the major consumers, the Government can make a distinction between high tension industries and low tension industries. As already stated above, this does not violate Article 14 of the Constitution.

31. It was then contended that under Section 4 power has been vested with the Government to change the tariff, but the peak hour charge is not the same as change of tariff. We do not agree. The peak hour charges is certainly a form of tariff imposed on the high tension consumers and it is well within the scope of Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Act of 1978. It is not the nomenclature but the substance of the matter which has to be seen.

32. It may be mentioned that the Electricity Regulatory Commission Act, 1998 was passed by Parliament for establishing Central and State

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

Regulatory Commissions. Under Section 17 of the said Act the Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission was constituted and under Section 29 of the Act the Commission was empowered to determine the tariff. By order dated 16.3.2003 the Tamil Nadu Regulatory Commission passed orders approving the levy of peak hour charges at 20% for consumption during peak hours.

33. Mrs.Nalini Chidambaram, learned senior counsel appearing for some of the appellants/petitioners submitted that G.O.Ms.No.17 dated 14.2.1997 is not conditional legislation, but delegated legislation. In our opinion, even if it is delegated legislation that will not help the case of the appellants/petitioners.

34. It may be noted that Article 254(2) of the Constitution states: -

> " Where a law made by the Legislature of a State with respect to one of the matters enumerated in the Concurrent List contains any provision repugnant to the provision of an earlier law made by Parliament or an existing law with respect to that matter, then, the law so made by the Legislature of such State shall, if it has been reserved for the consideration of the President and has received his assent, prevail in that State:
> Provided that nothing in this clause shall prevent Parliament from enacting at any time any law with respect to the same matter including a law adding to, amending, varying or repealing the law so made by the Legislature of the State."

35. Thus a perusal of the bare language of Article 254 (2) shows that it deals with subsequent laws made by the State Legislature and not delegated legislation. It is the subsequent law made by the State Legislature which requires the assent of the President of India if it is repugnant to a parliamentary law. This aspect has been clearly stated by the Supreme Court in K.S.E.Board v. Indian Aluminum Co.,(supra) . Hence the submission of Mrs.Nalini Chidambaram can be of no avail to the appellants/petitioners. In our opinion, G.O.Ms.No.17 dated 14.2.1997 is not a law made by the State Legislature, but it is delegated legislation, and hence Article 254(2) of the Constitution has no application. Hence it does not require the assent of the President of India. The notification dated 14.2.1997 has been given effect to only from 15.2.1997 and hence there is no question of retrospective operation of the same.

36. Apart from the above, it may be stated that on 16.03.2003 the Tamil Nadu State Regulatory Commission fixed the tariff for various consumers under the Electricity Regulatory Commission Act, which came into effect from 16.3.2003. The tariff determined by the Electricity Regulatory Commission also contains peak hour charges for industrial consumers which was challenged in appeal before this Court, but the said challenge was

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

rejected by a Division Bench of this Court in Coimbatore Stock Exchange Ltd. v. Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission, 2003 (4) CTC 385 . We are in entire agreement with the aforesaid decision of the Division Bench, and moreover the said decision is binding on us.

37. It was then contended by some of the learned counsels for the appellants/petitioners that the imposition of peak hour tariff is unreasonable, arbitrary and is in violation of Article 14 of the Constitution. We have already repelled this submission in our observations made above. In our opinion, there is reasonable classification between high tension consumers and low tension consumers as has been pointed out by the Supreme Court in M/s.Hindustan Zinc Limited v. Andhra Pradesh State Electricity Board,(supra). Hence there is no merit in this submission.

38. As regards High Tension industrial consumers who generate power from their own wind mills and supply electricity generated by them to the Board, the learned single Judge has dealt with this aspect in paragraphs 25 and 26 of his judgment, and we entirely agree with his reasoning. Hence, we are not repeating the same.

39. Before concluding we may mention that G.O.Ms.No.17 dated 14.2.1997 lays down a policy decision and ordinarily this Court cannot interfere with policy decisions of the administration unless they are clearly in violation of some statutory or constitutional provision or is shockingly arbitrary in the Wednesbury sense vide Tata Cellular Vs. Union of India, AIR 1996 SC 11, Om Kumar Vs. Union of India, AIR 2000 SC 3689, Union of India Vs. S.B.Vohra, 2004 (2) SCC 150, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board Vs. Tamil Nadu Electricity Board Engineers' Association, 2005 LIC 1579=2005 (1) MLJ 507, S.Ramamirtham Vs. Somesuvarapuram Girama Vivasaya Nala Pathukappu Sangam, 2005 WLR 451, Damoh Panna Sagar Rural Regional Bank Vs. Munna Lal Jain, 2005 (1) LLJ 730, Union of India Vs. International Trading Company, JT 2003 Vol.4 SC 549 (para-17)= 2003 AIR SCW 2828 (para-18), Delhi Development Authority Vs. Vijaya C.Gurshaney (Mrs.), 2003 (7) SCC 301, Krishnan Kakkanth Vs. Government of Kerala, 1997 (9) SCC 495, O.N.G.C. Madras Port Contract Employees' Union Vs. The Management of O.N.G.C. Ltd., 2005 (2) MLJ 90, etc.

40. In our opinion the G.O.Ms.17 dated 14.2.1997 does not violate any statutory or constitutional provision, nor can it be said to be shockingly arbitrary.

41. In Haryana Financial Corporation and Another v. M/s Jagdamba Oil Mills and another (2002) 1 UPLBEC 937=AIR 2002 SC 834 (vide paragraph 10) the Supreme Court observed:

> "If the High Court cannot sit as an appellate authority over the decisions and orders of quasi-judicial authorities, it follows equally that it cannot do so in the case of administrative authorities. In the matter of administrative action, it is well known that more than one choice is available

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

to the administrative authorities. They have a certain amount of discretion available to them. They have "a right to choose between more than one possible course of action upon which there is room for reasonable people to hold differing opinions as to which is to be preferred". (per Lord Diplock in Secretary of State for Education and Science V. Metropolitan Borough Counsel of Tameside, 1977 AC 1014). The Court cannot substitute its judgment for the judgment of administrative authorities in such cases. Only when the action of the administrative authority is so unfair or unreasonable that no reasonable person would have taken that action, the Court can intervene. To quote the classic passage from the judgment of Lord Greene M.R. in Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd. V. Wednesbury Corporation, 1947 (2) ALL ER 680:

"It is true the discretion must be exercised reasonably. Now what does that mean? Lawyers familiar with the phraseology commonly used in relation to exercise of statutory discretions often use the word 'unreasonable' in a rather comprehensive sense. It has frequently been used and is frequently used as a general description of the things that must not be done. For instance, a person entrusted with the discretion must, so to speak, direct himself properly in law. He must call his own attention to the matters, which he is bound to consider. He must exclude from his consideration matters, which are irrelevant to what he has to consider. If he does not obey those rules, he may truly be said, and often is said, to be acting 'unreasonably.' Similarly, there may be something so absurd that no sensible person could ever dream that it lay within the powers of the authority".

42. In Tata Cellular vs Union of India AIR 1996 SC 11 (vide paragraph 113) the Supreme Court observed:

(1) The modern trend points to judicial restraint in administrative action.

(2) The Court does not sit as a court of appeal over administrative decisions but merely reviews the manner in which the decision was made.

(3) The court does not have the expertise to correct an administrative decision. If a review of the administrative decision is permitted it will be substituting its own decision, without the necessary expertise, which itself may be fallible."

43. In the same decision the Supreme Court observed that judicial review is concerned with reviewing not the merits of the decision but the decision making process. (See also Pramod Kumar Misra vs. Indian Oil Corporation 2002 (4) AWC 3221, State of Kerala vs. Joseph Antony 1994 (1) SCC 658, etc.)

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

44. As Lord Denning observed:

> "This power to overturn executive decisions must be exercised very carefully, because you have got to remember that the executive and the local authorities have their very own responsibilities and they have the right to make decisions. The courts should be very wary about interfering and only interfere in extreme cases, that is, cases where the Court is sure they have gone wrong in law or they have been utterly unreasonable. Otherwise you would get a conflict between the courts and the government and the authorities, which would be most undesirable. The courts must act very warily in this matter."
> (See 'Judging the World' by Garry Sturgess and Philip Chubb).

45. In our opinion judges must maintain judicial self-restraint while exercising the powers of judicial review of administrative or legislative decisions.

> "In view of the complexities of modern society," wrote Justice Frankfurter, while Professor of Law at Harvard University, "and the restricted scope of any man's experience, tolerance and humility in passing judgment on the worth of the experience and beliefs of others become crucial faculties in the disposition of cases. The successful exercise of such judicial power calls for rare intellectual disinterestedness and penetration, lest limitation in personal experience and imagination operate as limitations of the Constitution. These insights Mr. Justice Holmes applied in hundreds of cases and expressed in memorable language:
>
> "It is a misfortune if a judge reads his conscious or unconscious sympathy with one side or the other prematurely into the law, and forgets that what seem to him to be first principles are believed by half his fellow men to be wrong.'"
> (See Frankfurter's 'Mr. Justice Holmes and the Supreme Court').

46. In our opinion the administrative authorities must be given freedom to do experimentations in exercising powers, provided of course they do not transgress the legal limits or act arbitrarily.

47. The impugned G.O.Ms.No.17 dated 14.2.1997 is an experiment made by the State Government to curb peak hour demand. In our opinion, the said experiment is well within the scope and ambit of Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Act of 1978. No doubt the State Government could have resorted to other methods of curbing peak hour demand (e.g. power cuts during peak hours), but it is not for this Court to tell the Government which option would have been better. Within the wide parameters of the law the

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

administration has several choices, and as long as the choice does not break the law nor is shockingly arbitrary this Court will not interfere.

48. The function of a judge has been described thus by Lawton LJ: " A Judge acts as a referee who can blow his judicial whistle when the ball goes out of play, but when the game restarts he must neither take part in it nor tell the players how to play" vide Laker Airways Ltd. v. Department of Trade (1977) QB 643 (724).

49. In our opinion adjudication must be done within the system of historically validated restraints and conscious minimisation of the judges preferences. The Court must not embarrass the administrative authorities and must realise that administrative authorities have expertise in the field of administration while the Court does not. In the words of Chief Justice Neely:

> " I have very few illusions about my own limitations as a Judge. I am not an accountant, electrical engineer, financer, banker, stockbroker or system management analyst. It is the height of folly to expect Judges intelligently to review a 5000 page record addressing the intricacies of a public utility operation. It is not the function of a Judge to act as a super board, or with the zeal of a pedantic school master substituting its judgment for that of the administrator."

50. In administrative matters the Court should therefore ordinarily defer to the judgment of the administrators unless the decision is clearly illegal or shockingly arbitrary.

51. In this connection Justice Frankfurter while Professor of Law at Harvard University wrote in 'The Public and its Government' --

> " With the great men of the Supreme Court constitutional adjudication has always been statecraft. As a mere Judge, Marshall had his superiors among his colleagues. His supremacy lay in his recognition of the practical needs of government. The great judges are those to whom the Constitution is not primarily a text for interpretation but the means of ordering the life of a progressive people."

In the same book Justice Frankfurter also wrote---

> " In simple truth, the difficulties that government encounters from law do not inhere in the Constitution. They are due to the judges who interpret it. That document has ample resources for imaginative statesmanship, if judges have imagination for statesmanship."

52. In Keshvananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, AIR 1973 SC 1461 (vide para 1547) Khanna, J. observed:

> "In exercising the power of judicial review, the Courts cannot be oblivious of the practical needs of

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

the government. The door has to be left open for trial and error."

53. In Indian Railway Construction Co. Limited vs. Ajay Kumar (2003) 2 UPLBEC 1206 (vide para 14) the Supreme Court observed that there are three grounds on which administration action is subject to control by judicial review. The first ground is illegality, the second is irrationality and the third is procedural impropriety. These principles were highlighted by Lord Diplock in Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister for the Civil Service 1984 (3) All ER 935. The Supreme Court observed that the Court will be slow to interfere in such matters relating to administrative functions unless the decision is tainted by any vulnerability enumerated above, like illegality, irrationality and procedural impropriety. The famous case, commonly known as the 'Wednesbury's case', is treated as the landmark in laying down various principles relating to judicial review of administrative or statutory discretion.

54. Lord Diplock explained irrationality as follows:

" By irrationality I mean what can be now be succinctly referred to as Wednesbury unreasonableness. It applies to a decision which is so outrageous in its defiance of logic or of accepted moral standards that no sensible person who had applied his mind to the question to be decided could have arrived at it."

55. In our opinion the impugned G.O.Ms.No.17 dated 14.2.1997 cannot be said to be so outrageous in its defiance of logic or of accepted moral standards that no sensible person could have arrived at it.

56. It is well settled that in policy matters this Court has a very limited scope of interference vide Union of India vs. International Trading Co., J.T. 2003 (4) SC 549 (para 17), State of Punjab vs. Ram Lubhaya, 1998 (4) SCC 117, Krishnan Kakkanth vs. Government of Kerala 1997 (9) SCC 495, G.B. Mahajan vs. Jalgaon Municipal Council AIR 1991 SC 1153, Federation of Railway Officers Association vs. Union of India, 2003 (4) SCC 289.

57. In Union of India vs. International Trading Co. 2003 (51) ALR 598 (vide paragraph 17) the Supreme Court observed:

"The Courts as observed in G.P. Mahajan v. Jalgaon Municipal Council, AIR 1994 SC 988 are kept out of the lush field of administration policy except where the policy is inconsistent with the express or implied provision of a statute which creates the power to which the policy relates, or where a decision made in purported exercise of power is such that a repository of the power acting reasonably and in good faith could not have made it. But there has to be a word of caution.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

Something overwhelming must appear before the Court will intervene. That is and ought to be a difficult onus for an applicant to discharge. The Courts are not very good at formulating or evaluating policy. Sometimes when the Courts have intervened on policy grounds the Court's view of the range of policies open under the statute or of what is unreasonable policy has not got public acceptance. On the contrary, curial views of policy have been subjected to stringent criticism.

As Professor Wade points out (in Administrative Law by H.W.R. Wade, 6th Edition), there is ample room within the legal boundaries for radical differences of opinion in which neither side is unreasonable. The reasonableness in administrative law must therefore distinguish between proper course and improper abuse of power. Nor is the test the Court's own standard of reasonableness as it might conceive it in a given situation. The point to note is that the thing is not unreasonable in the legal sense merely because the Court thinks it to be unwise."

58. In Tamil Nadu Education Dept., Ministerial and General Subordinate Services Association vs. State of Tamil Nadu and others, AIR 1980 SC 379, the Supreme Court while examining the scope of interference by the Courts in public policy held that the Court cannot strike down a circular / Government Order or a policy merely because there is a variation or contradiction. The Court observed: "Life is sometimes contradiction and even inconsistency is not always a virtue. What is important is to know whether mala fides vitiates or irrational and extraneous factors fouls".

In that decision the Court also observed:

"Once, the principle is found to be rational, the fact that a few freak instances of hardship may arise on either side cannot be a ground to invalidate the order or the policy. Every cause claims a martyr and however, unhappy we be to see the seniors of yesterdays becoming the juniors of today, this is an area where, absent arbitrariness and irrationality, the Court has to adopt a hands-off policy."

59. In Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and High Secondary Education and others vs. Paritosh Bhupesh Kumarsheth, AIR 1984 SC 1543, the Supreme Court considered the scope of judicial review in a case of policy decision and held as under:-

"The Court cannot sit in judgment over the wisdom of the policy evolved by the Legislature and the sub-ordinate regulation making body. It may be a wise policy, which will fully effectuate the purpose of the enactment or it may be lacking in effectiveness and hence calling for revision and improvement. But any drawbacks in the policy incorporated in a rule or regulation will not render it ultra vires and the Court cannot strike it down on the ground that in its opinion, it is

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

not a wise or prudent policy but is even a foolish one, and that it will not really serve to effectuate the purpose of the Act. The legislature and its delegate are the sole repositories of the power to decide what policy should be pursued in relation to matters covered by the Act and there is no scope for any interference by the Courts unless the particular provision impugned before it can be said to suffer from any legal infirmity in the sense of its being wholly beyond the scope of the regulation-making power or it being inconsistent with any of the provisions of the parent enactment or in violation of any of the limitations imposed by the Constitution."

60. A similar view has been reiterated in Delhi Science Forum and others vs. Union of India and another, AIR 1996 SC 1356 ; U.P. Kattha Factories Association vs. State of U.P. and others, (1996) 2 SCC 97; and Rameshwar Prasad vs. Managing Director, U.P. Rajkiya Nirman Nigam Limited and others (1999) 8 SCC 381.

61. In Netai Bag and others vs. State of West Bengal and others, (2000) 8 SCC 262 (vide para20), the Supreme Court observed:

> "The Court cannot strike down a policy decision taken by the government merely because it feels that another decision would have been fairer or wiser or more scientific or logical."

62. Hence we cannot strike down G.O.Ms.No.17 dated 14.2.1997 on the ground that there could be a better method of curbing or reducing the peak hour demand.

63. The Court may feel that a better decision could have been taken or some other course of action could have been adopted by the legislature or executive to curtail the peak hour demand, but on this ground it cannot strike down the law or the administrative decision. The legislature and the executive authorities in their wisdom are free to choose different methods of solving a problem and the Court cannot say that this or that method should have been adopted. As Mr. Justice Cardozo of the U.S. Supreme Court observed in Anderson vs. Wilson, 289 U.S. 20:

> "We do not pause to consider whether a statute differently conceived and framed would yield results more consonant with fairness and reason. We take this statute as we find it."

64. The Government is entitled to make pragmatic adjustments and policy decisions which may be necessary or called for under the prevalent peculiar circumstances. In Netai Bag v. State of W.B (supra), the Court referred to and relied upon its earlier judgments in State of Madhya Pradesh vs. Nandlal Jaiswal, AIR 1987 SC 251 and Sachidanand Pandey vs. State of West Bengal, AIR 1987 SC 1109, wherein the Court held that judicial interference with policy decision is permissible only if the

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

decision is shown to be patently arbitrary, discriminatory or mala fide. A similar view has been reiterated in Union of India and others vs. Dinesh Engineering Corporation and another, (2001) 8 SCC 491.

65. In Ugar Sugar Works Ltd. vs. Delhi Administration and others, (2001) 3 SCC 635, it has been held that in exercise of their powers of judicial review, the Courts do not ordinarily interfere with policy decisions of the executive unless the policy can be faulted on the ground of mala fide, unreasonableness, arbitrariness or unfairness etc. If the policy cannot be touched on any of these grounds, the mere fact that it may affect the interests of a party does not justify invalidating the policy.

66. In State of Himachal Pradesh and another vs. Padam Dev and others (2002) 4 SCC 510, the Supreme Court held that unless a policy decision is demonstrably capricious or arbitrary and not informed by any reason or discriminatory or infringing any statute or the Constitution it cannot be a subject of judicial interference under the provisions of Articles 32, 226 and 136 of the Constitution. Similar view, has been reiterated in State of Rajasthan and others vs. Lata Arun, (2002) 6 SCC 252.

67. This Court cannot ordinarily interfere in administrative matters, since the administrative authorities are specialists in matters relating to the administration. The court does not have the expertise in such matters, and ordinarily should leave such matters to the discretion of the administrative authorities. It is only in rare and exceptional cases, where the Wednesbury principle applies, that the Court should interfere, vide Tata Cellular vs. Union of India, (1994) 6 SCC 651, Om Kumar vs. Union of India, 2001 (2) SCC 386. In U.P., Financial Corporation V. M/s Naini Oxygen & Acetylence Gas Ltd. J.T. 1994 (7) S.C.551 (vide para 21) the Supreme Court observed:

> " However, we cannot lose sight of the fact that the Corporation is an independent autonomous statutory body having its own constitution and rules to abide by, and functions and obligations to discharge. As such, in the discharge of its function it is free to act according to its own light. The views it forms and the decisions it takes are on the basis of the information in its possession and the advice it receives and according to its own perspective and calculations. Unless its action is mala fide, even a wrong decision taken by it is not open to challenge. It is not for the Courts or a third party to substitute its decision, however more prudent, commercial or business like it may be , for the decision of the Corporation. Hence, whatever the wisdom (or the lack of it) of the conduct of the Corporation, the same cannot be assailed by making the Corporation liable."

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

68. In Krishnan Kakkanth Vs. Government of Kerala, (1997) 9 SCC 495 the Supreme Court observed:-

> "To ascertain unreasonableness and arbitrariness in the context of Article 14 of the Constitution, it is not necessary to enter upon any exercise for finding out the wisdom in the policy decision of the State Government. It is immaterial whether a better or more comprehensive policy decision could have been taken. It is equally immaterial if it can be demonstrated that the policy decision is unwise and is likely to defeat the purpose for which such decision has been taken. Unless the policy decision is demonstratably capricious or arbitrary and not informed by any reason whatsoever or it suffers from the vice of discrimination or infringes any statute or provisions of the Constitution, the policy decision cannot be struck down. It should be borne in mind that except for the limited purpose of testing the public policy in the context of illegality and unconstitutionality, courts should avoid "embarking on uncharted ocean of public policy".

69. As observed by the Supreme Court in M.H.Qureshi Vs. State of Bihar, AIR 1958 SC 731, the Court must presume that the legislature understands and correctly appreciates the needs of its own people. The legislature is free to recognize degrees of harm and may confine its restrictions to those where the need is deemed to be the clearest. In the same decision it was also observed that the legislature is the best judge of what is good for the community on whose suffrage it came into existence. In our opinion, the same principle also applies to the executive decisions, as the executive is accountable to the legislature in a democracy.

70. One of the earliest scholarly treatments of the scope of judicial review is Prof. James Bradley Thayer's article "The Origin and Scope of the American Doctrine of Constitutional Law", published in 1893 in the Harvard Law Review. This paper is a singularly important piece of American legal scholarship, if for no other reason than that Justices Holmes and Brandeis of the U.S.Supreme Court, among modern judges, carried its influence with them to the Bench, as also did Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Thayer, who was a Professor of Law at Harvard University, strongly urged that the courts must be astute not to trench upon the proper powers of the other departments of government, nor to confine their discretion. Full and free play must be allowed to "that wide margin of considerations which address themselves only to the practical judgment of a legislative body or the executive authorities". Moreover, every action of the other departments embodies an implicit decision on their part that it was within their constitutional power to act as they did. The judiciary must accord the utmost respect to this determination, even though it be a tacit one. This meant for Thayer, and he attempted to prove that it had generally

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

meant to the courts, that a statute or a policy decision could be struck down as unconstitutional only "when those who have the right to make it have not merely made a mistake, but have made a very clear one, so clear that it is not open to rational question". After all, the Constitution is not a legal document of the nature of a title deed or the like, to be read closely and construed with technical finality, but a complex charter of government, looking to unforeseeable future exigencies. Most frequently, reasonable men will differ about its proper construction. The Constitution leaves open "a range of choice and judgment," and hence constitutional construction 'involves hospitality to large purposes, not merely textual exegesis'.

71. In Lochner Vs. New York, 198 U.S. 45 (1905), Mr.Justice Holmes, the celebrated Judge of the U.S. Supreme Court in his classic dissenting judgment pleaded for judicial tolerance of state legislative action even when the Court may disapprove of the State Policy. Similarly, in his dissenting judgment in Griswold Vs. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479, Mr.Justice Hugo Black of the U.S. Supreme Court warned that "unbounded judicial creativity would make this Court a day-to-day Constitutional Convention". Justice Frankfurter has pointed out that great judges have constantly admonished their brethren of the need for discipline in observing their limitations (see Frankfurter's 'Some Reflections on the Reading of Statutes').

72. In view of the above, we find no merit in these writ appeals and writ petitions and they are accordingly dismissed. No costs. Consequently, W.P.M.Ps and W.A.M.Ps are also dismissed.

Sd/-
Asst. Registrar.

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar.

pv/

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

To

1. The Secretary to the Government of Tamilnadu
   Energy Department, Fort St.George, Chennai-9.

2. The Secretary to the Government Tamilnadu,
   Public Works (Electricity) Department, Fort St.George, Chennai-9

3. The Chairman, Tamilnadu Electricity Board,
   K.R.R.Maaligai, Chennai-1.

4. The Chairman,
   Tamilnadu Electricity Board,
   800 Anna Salai, Chennai-2.

5. The Superintending Engineer, TNEB
   Virudhunagar Electricity Distribution Circle,
   Virudhunagar District.

6. The Superintending Engineer,[TNEB]
   Gobi Electricity Distribution Circle Erode.

7. The Superintending Engineer
   Coimbatore Electricity Distribution Circle,
   Coimbatore Metro, Coimbatore District.

8. The Superintending Engineer,
   Erode Electricity Distribution Circle,
   Erode District.

9. The Superintending Engineer,
   Udumalpet Electricity Distribution Circle,
   Udumalpet.

10. The Superintending Engineer,
    Tamilnadu Electricity Board
    Mettur Electricity Distribution Circle,
    Mettur.

11. The Superintending Engineer,
    Coimbatore Electricity Distribution Circle,
    Coimbatore North,
    Coimbatore District.

12. The Superintending Engineer,
    Sivagangai Electricity Distribution Circle,
    Sivagangai District.

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

13.The Superintending Engineer,
[TNEB] Coimbatore Electricity Distribution Circle, Coimbatore.

14.The Superintending Engineer,
Gobi Electricity Distribution Circle, Gobi.

15.The Superintending Engineer
Coimbatore Electricity Distribution Circle, South, CBE.

16.The Superintending Engineer
[TNEB] Thudialur Electricity Distribution Circle,
Thudialur, Coimbatore.

17.The Superintending Engineer
Tirunelveli Electricity Distribution Circle,
Tirunelveli District.

18.The Superintending Engineer
[TNEB] Udumalpet Electricity Distribution Circle[North]
Udumalpet.

19.The Superintending Engineer
Tamilnadu Electricity Board,
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle, Chennai.

20.The Superintending Engineer [TNEB]
Ramnad Electricity Distribution Circle, Ramanathapuram.

21.The Superintending Engineer
[TNEB] Madurai Electricity Distribution Circle, Madurai.

22.The Superintending Engineer
[TNEB] Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle [West],
AB-5, Plot No.4898, II Avenue,
Anna Nagar, Chennai-40.

23.The Superintending Engineer
Salem Electricity Distribution Circle, Salem.

24.The Superintending Engineer
Dindugal Electricity Distribution Circle, Dindugal.

25.The Superintending Engineer, TNEB,
karur Electricity Distribution Circle, Karur.

26.The Superintending Engineer
TNEB, Dharmapuri Electricity Distribution Circle,
Dharmapuri.

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

27.The Superintending Engineer
Coimbatore Electricity Distribution Circle,
Coimbatore South,
Coimbatore District.

28.The Superintending Engineer, TNEB,
Electricity Distribution Circle, Vellore.

29.The Superintending Engineer
Mettur Electricity Distribution Circle, Salem District.

30.The Superintending Engineer
Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle, Tuticorin.

31.The Superintending Engineer
Namakkal Electricity Distribution Circle, Namakkal.

32.The Assistant Engineer (O&M) TNEB,
Panjetty Village, Ponneri Taluk,
Tiruvallur District.

33.The Superintending Engineer
Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, T.N.E.B., Theni.

34.The Superintending Engineer [TNEB]
Pudukottai Electricity Distribution Circle [North & South]
Pudukottai.

35.The Secretary, Electricity
The Tamilnadu Regulatory Commission,
17, Third Main Road, Seethammal Colony,
Alwarpet, Chennai-18.

36.The Additional Engineer,
TNEB, SIPCOT Industrial Estate,
Gummudipoondi.

37.The Superintending Engineer (Metro)
Trichy Electricity Distribution Circle, Trichy.

38.The Superintending Engineer, TNEB,
Thiruvannamalai Electricity Distribution Circle,
Thiruvannamalai.

39.The Superintending Engineer,
Kanchipuram Electricity Distribution Circle,
Kanchipuram.

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

40.The Superintending Engineer
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle(S)
K.K.Nagar, Chennai.

41.The Superintending Engineer(TNEB)
Chittode Electricity Distribution Circle,
Chittode.

42.The Chief Electrical Inspector,
Thiru Vi.Ka. Industrial Estate,
Guindy, Chennai-32.

43.The Chief Additional Engineer,
Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle,
Tuticorin.

44.The Accounts Officer,
O/O the Superintending Engineer,
Coimbatore Electricity Distribution Circle,
(North), Coimbatore.

+ 5 Ccs to Mr.M.Md.Ibrahim Ali, Advocate SR NO 35886

+ 1 CC to Mr. V. Sanjeevi, Advocate SR NO 35757

+ 1 CC to Mr. R.S.Pandiaraj, Advocate SR NO 35790

+ 2 CCs to Mr. G.Vasudevan, Advocate SR NO 35549

+ 10 CCs to Mr.M. Kamalanathan, Advocate SR NO 35711

+ 1 CC to Mr. T.S.Sivagnanam, Advocate SR NO 35489

gm,tej,ak(co)
gp,kk,km,dv,sr,bg,rvl/3.10.2005
Compared by N.Sobana & M. Thanga Priya

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/